THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—APRIL, 1900.—No. 98.

IMPERIALISM IN THE PHILIPPINES.

THE policy adopted by the Spanish monarch in the first occupation of the Philippines was told in a recent number of this magazine. It also described the results obtained by that policy in practice. It is instructive to compare it with the new imperialism which has been forced on them in the name of American civilization during the past year.

When Legaspi, in the sixteenth century, raised the Spanish flag in the uncivilized archipelago of San Lazaro, the objects proposed were clearly laid down in his instructions. They were: First, the conversion of its savage population to Christianity; second, their organization, when converted, on the model of the Spanish people of the time, and thirdly, the establishment of the supremacy of the Government of Spain among them, with the same powers as it exercised in Europe. That a civilized nation might justly take control of unorganized savage lands was generally admitted then, as now; but the limits of that control were much more clearly defined by public opinion. Savages were recognized as men, with the same rights to liberty, life and property as their civilized brothers. A Christian power had no right to impose its authority on strangers, except for their own real benefit or by their free consent. If imposed for any other cause it was regarded as tyranny and not to be tolerated by Christian conscience. Such was the doctrine laid down to the Span-

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ish court and the Spanish universities by Las Casas, and endorsed by the Spanish rulers themselves. It is not to be thought that these principles were always carried out, in practice, any more than the general laws of the United States are observed by all American citizens to-day; but at least they were recognized, and Spanish statesmen tried, in general, to put them in practice. Philip II. and his Governor, Legaspi, did so in the Philippine settlements. The latter before his death was able to claim with truth that he had obtained recognition of Spanish authority through the whole Philippine archipelago without war or bloodshed. It is a rare boast in the annals of colonial settlements by Europeans. Penn at Philadelphia and Calvert in Maryland are the only similar cases in our own land of former colonies. The peaceful character thus imprinted on the Philippine Government was little changed during the three centuries after Legaspi's death. There was only one really serious insurrection among the native converts in all that time—that of Silan, in 1759, after the capture of Manila by the English.

The course of the American occupation so far has been very different from Legaspi's. If directed by any definite policy, that policy has never been published, either to the natives of the islands or the citizens of the United States. Congress declared war on Spain without specifying any reason for such action. It declared, further, that the war was not made for the purpose of seizing territory, and especially Cuban territory. As the action of Spain during the war was strictly defensive, one cannot see on what grounds this intention could not be carried out; but it was certainly abandoned, without hesitation, by the Administration as soon as Congress had adjourned. Commodore Dewey's fleet entered Manila Bay, destroyed the weaker Spanish fleet, without loss of a man to itself, and threatened to lay the defenseless city in ashes if its Governor attempted any further resistance to American arms. It was not occupied by force for several months because there were no troops to garrison it if occupied. Meanwhile an insurrection, of especially ferocious character, was stirred up by representatives of the United States. Our Government had no policy at the time on the subject of territorial occupation. It had nothing to fear from the Spanish troops on the islands, yet its representatives deliberately involved the hitherto peaceful population in a civil war carried on with savage atrocity. Unarmed Spaniards, and especially priests, were treated with a barbarity unknown in civilized war. More than fifty priests were murdered and several hundred imprisoned and tortured. Churches were plundered and desecrated, and armed bands, recruited in part from the jails, were sent through the islands to rob and slay at will under the tacit protection of the American fleet and army. Though Aguinaldo was furnished with arms by American officers and obeyed generally the suggestions of our commanders, it does not appear that a word of reprobation was addressed by any of them to him on the atrocities done on prisoners, especially non-combatants. Indeed, Mr. Wildmann, our Consul General, urged the starvation or semi-starvation of the Spanish prisoners on his friend Aguinaldo. The spirit which prevailed was like that in which the English Government, during our own War of Independence, stirred up the Mohawks to the massacre of Wyoming. It was less excusable, as the Filipino cutthroats were not savages by condition, but a hitherto peaceful people stirred to savagery by reckless promises and the demoralization of plunder held out to them by American agents.

The misery inflicted on a peaceful population of many millions by setting a band of reckless adventurers over them to overthrow the whole social system at a blow seems not to have cost a thought to either American officers or our Administration. A few months before the American press and Congress were denouncing with fervid eloquence the horrors of civil war in Cuba and calling imperatively on the Spanish Government to sacrifice everything for its cessation in the "interests of humanity." A population four times larger than Cuba's was deliberately plunged into a similar condition by American officials for the sake of inflicting some injury on the power of Spain.

The war had been begun without alleged motive, and when the Spanish Government, after the destruction of its fleets, asked for its cessation our Administration appeared equally uncertain as to what terms it should ask as the price of peace. Its policy was like that of the old Norse Vikings in their descents on the coasts of France or England; but it hardly knew what ransom would best suit its own interests. The idea of any principle of international right or justice beyond the right of the strongest to take whatever he pleased, seems never to have been thought of. Still it was hardly worth while to send a fleet to burn the towns of Spain for the mere pleasure of destruction, so a "protocol" of peace was granted, by which Spain not only withdrew from Cuba, but ceded Puerto Rico and Guam to this country. It was provided further that the question of the Philippines, which had been raised solely by Admiral Dewey's entry into Manila Bay and destruction of the Spanish fleet there, should be settled later on, when Mr. McKinley should have made up his mind as to his own interests. The day after this protocol was signed the commanders of the American forces thought well to storm Manila, though its surrender for the time had been actually granted by the Spanish Government. Manila was stormed, accordingly, after a kind of sham battle which cost a number of lives without the shadow of necessity. An army, made up mostly of new levies with three months' military training, was placed in absolute control of a city of three hundred thousand people. It proceeded to rule it with all the confidence born of ignorance of the people, and even their language, that might be expected from such an army. In the words of a correspondent who belonged to one of the volunteer regiments, "The rifle, revolver and club did wonders in reforming the population," on the ideas of the new militia. The feelings of the people themselves towards the reform and reformers may be imagined.

In the meantime the rest of the islands were left a prey to anarchy. The greatest part of the Spanish troops were kept prisoners in Manila. The others were shut up in a few towns, and without supplies or orders were wholly unable to maintain order. Robber bands pillaged Panay and Mindanao while our Administration was thinking whether it had better withdraw from the islands altogether, keep Manila, demand the cession of Luzon, or that of all the Philippines. The last was finally decided on, and the Spanish Government, of course, was powerless to resist. The whole Spanish garrison in the islands had been less than fourteen thousand. That little force had preserved peace and order among a population of seven millions besides the outlying savage tribes. It was decided to send at once from forty to sixty thousand American troops to establish American authority there. At the same time the Administration was quite uncertain what form the new institutions ought to have. It was only sure that bayonets in plenty were needed for their introduction.

When Legaspi, on his landing in Cebu, was attacked by the native chiefs he drove his assailants off by discharges of artillery in the air, as he wanted to avoid bloodshed. The provisions he had to take by force he afterwards paid for at full value. When the natives sued for peace and offered tribute in price for it the Spanish Governor granted the first and declined the second. He was satisfied with the acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of the Spanish Crown, and on his part he recognized the right of the natives to govern themselves by their own laws. It cannot be said that the American imperialist policy shows to advantage beside Legaspi's.

When the late Emperor of France negotiated the annexation of Savoy and Nice by the Sardinian Government he considered it only just to take a vote of the population itself on the question of change of government. It is strange to find our Republican Administration, ruling on the principle that government is only of the people and for the people, paying no attention to the will of the people in the Philippines when changing their government of over three hundred years' standing. The new imperialism regards the popular will as having no place in the selection of rulers, at least outside the American continent. The ideas that it professes are wholly foreign to the habitual American ideas of government under which this nation has been formed.

What was the condition of the people of Manila under the military despotism set over them in the name of American liberty can be judged from the accounts published in the San Francisco papers before Aguinaldo came into collision with our troops. A correspondent of the *Call*, of that city, who was a corporal in one of the volunteer regiments, thus told it in December, 1898. It must be remembered that the soldiers he speaks of were all new recruits and almost all ignorant of the language or customs of the people whom they were authorized to rule at discretion:

"The Minnesota boys, when we first entered the city, were given the task of looking after its policing, and they have filled the bill to the limit, incidentally filling the Coroner's office at the same time. The native population had conceived something nearly akin to contempt for the American soldier, not being able to disassociate *kindness and justice* from weakness and cowardice. As soon as the boys got to work they started in to convince them of their mistake, and have, I imagine, succeeded fairly well. To give an idea of the methods employed I will relate a little occurrence of yesterday morning:

"There is a large market just at the foot of the Colquante bridge which is the rendezvous of a rough gang. There gambling is carried on much in the same manner as it is in Chinatown at home—behind closed doors. Yesterday a Minnesota policeman, a mere boy, hearing the chink of coin, started in to investigate, and entering one of the many shacks came upon a game running with a forced draught. He ordered the proprietor to close the place and come with him; but the Filipino instead of obeying made a grab for the young fellow. The Filipino died right then and there. Then the young fellow *turned loose on everything in sight.* A tremendous crowd gathered. Three members of the California guard hurried to the scene and waded through the mob with butts and bayonets, leaving sore heads and bleeding flanks to mark their path. When they reached the shack they found it filled with smoke, through which they perceived Filipino bodies lying where the wounded fell, while the Minnesota guard was discovered sitting on a table munching an orange while waiting for some one to come and clean up the debris.

"A few such instances have served in a great measure to teach the anarchy loving Malay the error of his ways."

The flippancy with which these murders are described and the admiration for the coolness of the soldier who "sat munching an orange" over the bodies of three or four unarmed victims of his revolver, tells sufficiently its own tale. The brand of "anarchy loving" gratuitously affixed to them is also noteworthy. The writer continues to tell how the Island of Panay, which had not yet been ceded to the United States, was faring under the new régime of delay:

"While these pacific measures are progressing in Manila the people of Iloilo are having a regular monkey-and-parrot time. That unfortunate city is in a state of chaos. The insurgents are besieging it on the outside, while the native population is rioting within the walls. The Spanish garrison, worn out by long and constant service, suffering from wounds and sickness, lacking food and medicines and utterly without hope of succor from its own government, continues to fight with the desperation born of the knowledge that a massacre will follow capitulation. Business is entirely suspended. The stores are closed, residences are barricaded and soldiers and civilians pray that there may soon come to their relief those same American troops which only a few months ago they so affected to despise. It is probable that a few days will see a couple or three regiments sent down there to put things to rights."

This was "substituting the mild sway of justice for arbitrary rule," as President McKinley modestly called it in his proclamation of the 5th of January. There is a touch of Mephistopheles about that proclamation which almost tempts one to credit the writer with a grim, if cynical, sense of humor. It declares that the military power must be absolute over the whole of the islands, until the legislation of the United States should see fit to change it, and as the President's own part in making the burthen easy, he adds:

"In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the sovereignty of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation *to announce and proclaim*, in the most public manner, that we come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who either by active aid or honest admission coöperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these benefits and purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

"Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory, in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime, are to be considered as continuing in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals as far as possible. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen, so far as may be practicable, from the inhabitants of the islands."

What the effect of the proclamation of good intentions thus solemnly ordered would have in reconciling the population to the rule of rifle and revolver in the hands of the volunteer police as above described may be easily guessed. It is not easy for even an American familiar with English to make out the sense of this wonderful document. How "the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the *sovereignty of the persons and property* of the people of the islands" passes comprehension. How people can "coöperate by honest admission with the Government to give effect to these benefits *and purposes*" is equally bewildering. The classification of the future judges and officials into "those who may accept the supremacy of the United States," or others "chosen from the inhabitants of the islands" is a still more brilliant flower of rhetoric. It may be added that the islands at this time were not American territory and no oath of allegiance could be lawfully accepted from them at this time.

This was, indeed, a change from the peace of the older time under the so-called tyranny of Spain; but there was worse in store for the ill-starred population, whose fate had been suddenly changed, because American politicians were horrified over the alleged cruelty of Spanish warfare in Cuba. Though the American occupation was confined to Manila, pending the ratification of the peace treaty, a collision occurred with Aguinaldo's soldiers outside its walls on the 4th of February. Three Filipino soldiers crossed into the American lines, and an American sentry shot and killed one of them, in much the same spirit as the young soldier, above described, emptied his revolver into the native cardplayers. The comrades of the slain man at once opened fire on the American lines. The result may be best described in the words of one of the participants, a Californian soldier in the Third Artillery, whose letter was published in San Francisco shortly afterwards. He writes:

"A small body of insurgents had attempted to cross San Juan bridge and was driven back. It returned with reinforcements, and the second volley followed its attack upon the line. A few seconds after the second report every regiment in Manila was lined up outside its quarters, waiting impatiently for the signal to move. And of all the cheering you ever heard in your life! It showed that every soldier in Manila was 'just dying' for a chance to get at the black devils.

"The next morning the Americans charged over the trenches and swept everything before them. Our boat then steamed up to the firing line and started to shell the towns on the river. We struck Santa Ana, the insurgent headquarters, first, and after an hour's hot work we had the town in flames and what was left of the Filipinos running like frightened sheep.

"When we stopped shelling Santa Ana the First California Regiment entered, and what we had not burned they finished with a vengeance. Their motto, as well as that of the other regiments, is: '*The only good Filipino is a dead one; take no prisoners, as lead is cheaper than rice.*' At times we could hardly see one another through the powder smoke. We could tell, though, by the sound and by the regularity of the volley firing that our boys were giving them hades, and could see that the Americans in the other part of the town were pursuing the same course as we—that is, burning everything around them.

"The Tennessee men were on the right, and an orderly came aboard and reported that they were killing every native in sight, *whether a soldier or not.* We were then recalled by General Otis and had to remain in front of the place guarding it, while the rest of the boys were *enjoying themselves shooting 'niggers' on the run.* All along the river we could see the corpses of the natives lying on the banks or floating down the river. The Idahos at one place were burying the natives, and at one hole I saw them throw in sixty-five bodies.

"Our own battery did not do much Saturday night, but the next morning they made one of the grandest charges of history. They charged a cemetery that was full of natives and piled them up till you couldn't count the dead. They say our major bears a charmed life. He rode at the head of the column, urging the men forward and telling them to spare not even the wounded, thrusting his own sword through every wounded insurgent he passed."

Ten days later a Washington volunteer described the result to the families around Manila thus in the Seattle *Times:*

"The native women and children in our neighborhood and beyond, as well as the old men and sick, are absolutely starving to death. Their husbands and fathers have been killed, wounded, captured or driven back to Malolos, their houses burned to the ground with all their earthly possessions, and they are left with no means of subsistence. They attempt to come into the American lines by thousands, but have to be turned back. We cannot feed them."

On the 28th of February another California volunteer, Simon by name, told the subsequent events thus:

"After leaving troops in the captured towns we made a complete circuit and burned about twenty towns, making about *a hundred thousand people homeless.*"

On the 29th of March an *Examiner* correspondent tells how the work proceeded then:

"The country between Marilao and Manila presents a picture of desolation. Smoke is curling from hundreds of ash heaps, and the remains of trees and fences torn by shrapnel are to be seen everywhere. The general appearance of the country is as if it had been swept by a cyclone. The roads are strewn with the furniture and clothing dropped in flight by the Filipinos. The only persons remaining behind are a few aged persons too infirm to escape. They camp beside ruins of their former homes and beg passers-by for any kind of assistance. The majority of them are living on the generosity of our soldiers, who give them portions of their rations. The dogs of the Filipinos cower in the bushes, still terrified and barking, while hundreds of pigs may be seen searching for food. Bodies of dead Filipinos are stranded in the shallows of the rivers or are resting in the jungle where they crawled to die or were left in the wake of the hurriedly retreating army. These bodies give forth a horrible odor, but there is no time at present to bury them. An old woman was found hidden in a house at Meycuayan yesterday just dead, apparently from fright and hunger."

The Peace Commissioners in their recent report add their experience. They write of Manila:

"The situation of the city when we got there was bad. Incendiary fires occurred daily. The streets were almost deserted. Half the native population had fled, and most of the remainder were shut in their houses. Business was at a standstill. Insurgent troops everywhere faced our lines, and the sound of the rifle fire was frequently audible in our house. A reign of terror prevailed. Filipinos who had favored Americans feared assassination, and few had the courage to come out openly for us. Fortunately there were among this number some of the best men of the city."

This ghastly record speaks for itself. It is true that accounts of this kind are no longer permitted to pass the censor's office in Manila established by General Otis, but there is little ground for hoping that the same ruthless destruction is not still going on. The sole principle that seemed to be recognized by either the American officers or the American administration was that absolute submission to the will of Congress was the condition on which this carnival of blood and fire could be stopped. Professor Schurman, of the Peace Commission, on the 22d of May offered what he was pleased to call "terms" to the natives in arms as follows:

"While the final decision as to the form of government is in the hands of the Congress, the President, under his military powers, pending the action of Congress, stands ready to offer the following form of government:

"A Governor General, to be appointed by the President; a cabinet, to be appointed by the President; the heads of departments and Judges to be either Americans or Filipinos, or both, and also a general advisory council, its members to be chosen by the people by a form of suffrage to be hereafter carefully determined upon.

"The President *earnestly desires that bloodshed cease* and that the people of the Philippines at an early date enjoy the largest measure of self-government compatible with peace and order."

This while the blood-shedding was almost exclusively the work of the American troops! !

The Filipino Commissioners asked for a truce until they could lay these propositions before their people, but that was rejected as preposterous. Professor Schurman told the Filipinos they had no means of gathering the people together, as the Americans control most of the ports. He also reminded them that a *liberal form* of government was offered them, and pointed out that it was better than the conditions existing under Spanish rule.

How even so learned a man as the professor could suppose peace proposals would be accepted without the consideration of the men asked to accept them is as incomprehensible as his unctuous assertion that the war was unavoidable, though the attacked natives were asking a truce to settle terms if possible.

The war went on in this purposeless, savage way while the Peace Commission was proclaiming pompously "that the aim and object of the American Government, apart from the fulfillment of the solemn obligations it has assumed towards the family of nations by the acceptance of sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, is the well-being, prosperity and happiness of the Philippine people, and their elevation and advancement to a position among the most civilized peoples of the world. The President believes this felicity—the perfection of the Philippine people—is to be brought about by the assurance of peace and order, by the guarantee of civil and religious liberty, by the establishment of courts of justice, by the cultivation of letters, the sciences and liberal and practical arts, by the enlargement of intercourse with foreign nations, by the expansion of industries and the pursuits of trade and commerce, by the multiplication of improvement in the means of internal communication, by development with modern mechanical inventions of the great natural resources of the archipelago and, in a word, by the uninterrupted devotion of the people to the pursuits of useful objects and the realization of those noble ideals which constitute the higher civilization of mankind." Such was the promise while the luckless natives were being shot down.

A few days before this proclamation the *Examiner's* correspondent described the operations of General Wheaton's flying brigade, which had just made a tour around the bay. "About four thousand of our troops moved over the country, firing tens of thousands of cartridges at two or three hundred retreating men. The village of Cainta was burned. We lost a few men killed and a great many wounded and we cleared a great stretch of thicket, hill and flat country of the insurgents. *We may have killed a thousand* in the whole movement, but there were only *a few score of bodies to show* for it. We took 300 prisoners, but we captured few arms. But what was it all worth? When we burned all the houses in the country and withdrew our lines to the river, the insurgents returned to their old places. General Otis complains that the insurgents will not concentrate. That was the complaint of General Weyler in Cuba. Our army is on the defensive. These sallies here and there *may furnish good material for war despatches* to Washington, but they do little to end the war. Meanwhile property in the island is being destroyed in every direction. Look where you will and columns of smoke darken the horizon. Unless we move against the main insurgent army, the agricultural population will become homeless vagabonds."

Another correspondent, Mr. Brooks, described the details of the methods used in a spirit too remarkable to be overlooked. He wrote to the San Francisco *Bulletin* with chuckling brutality:

"The Church of Caloocan is a wreck, and stands an example of what an American gunner can do with some of his long-distance guns. The bombarding vessels were fully three miles away in the deeper waters of Manila Bay, but the Monadnock dropped one of those thirteen-inch terrors through the corner of the church with the neatness of a target practice at short range. This killed a large number of refugees and nearly finished the large stone edifice, but there are plenty of evidence of other shots, including the artillery efforts. The church, rearing above the tall trees of the village, *made a capital target.* The city prison was also subjected to quite rough treatment by the shells, and its stone dungeons well shaken up. Caloocan is said to have contained 5,000 people. To-day there is not a thatched hut nor a man left. The troops found it absolutely necessary to burn the buildings in order to prevent them from being used as places of refuge for Filipino sharpshooters. There was accordingly a holocaust that could be seen for miles, and even after darkness fell the flames lit the skies. There are half a dozen villages similar to Caloocan between Manila and Malolos. Many of them are within gunshot of the bay, and unless something unexpected happens they will suffer the same fate as their sister village."

In the light of these burning villages, what is a man to think of the Peace Commissioners unctuously telling the Filipino people "that the United States are not only willing, but anxious, to establish in the Philippine Islands an enlightened system of government under which the Philippine people may enjoy the largest measure of home rule, and the amplest liberty consonant with the supreme ends of government, and compatible with those obligations which the United States has assumed toward the civilized nations of the world? The United States is striving earnestly for the welfare and advancement of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands. There can be no real conflict between American sovereignty and the rights and liberties of the Philippine people, for just as the United States stands ready to furnish armies and navies and all the infinite resources of a great and powerful nation to maintain and support their rightful supremacy over the Philippine Islands, so it is even more solicitous to spread peace and happiness among the Philippine people, guarantee them rightful freedom, protect them in their just privileges and immunities, accustom them to free self-government in ever-increasing measure and encourage them in those democratic aspirations, sentiments and ideals which are promised and are fruitful to national development."

In the same document the Commissioners tell what the insurgent natives had demanded of Spain two years earlier; namely, Parliamentary representation, freedom of the press, religious toleration, economic autonomy and laws similar to those of Spain. The abolition of the power of "banishment was demanded, with legal equality for all persons in law and equality in pay between Spanish and native civil servants." The Commissioners comment with calm assurance that these demands had good grounds because "in practice every Spanish Governor did what he saw fit, and the evil deeds of men in the Government were hidden from Spain by strict press censorship." No Spanish Governor had left a hundred thousand natives homeless, or slaughtered a thousand fleeing insurgents as a military exhibition of gunnery. The recklessness of truth displayed by the Commissioners is scarcely less revolting than the horrors of the war itself.

To describe the action of Americans in the Philippines as having anything in common with the free institutions which are the proudest boast of our country is a simple falsehood. From the beginning the framers of our Government jealously guarded against the power of military force at home. The present administration makes it absolute in the Philippines. If such be American liberties, they are not different from those enjoyed by the subjects of the Sultan of Turkey.

The system of government which had directed the Philippines for over three hundred years and under which its civilized population of seven million people had grown from some scattered savage tribes was abolished at a stroke of the pen by the American administration. It had absolutely nothing to substitute for it at the time. It was quite uncertain whether the real interests or even the popular sentiment of our country demanded the possession of the islands thus left to anarchy. What the seven million Filipinos wished, or even what manner of a people they were, was treated as of no importance whatever. A military officer without experience of legislation or civil administration and unacquainted with the language, habits or institutions of the country was vested with absolute powers to rule the islands and furnished with a force of new recruits double the whole strength of our national army two years ago. A commission of two college professors, one of whom had written a book on the Philippines, an old politician who had been our Minister to China, and the commanding general and admiral, was charged with due solemnity to "facilitate the most humane and effective extension of authority throughout the islands, and to secure with the least possible delay the benefits of a wise and generous protection of life and property to the inhabitants."

This remarkable description of the only measure thought of by American statesmen to provide for the government of a population as large as that of the late Confederate States is taken from President McKinley's own message of the 5th of December, a full year later. It need scarcely be added that the commission effected absolutely nothing. Its civilian members visited Manila, held meetings, interviewed some natives and gravely forwarded a report to Washington in November, which set forth at length its own benevolent intentions, but had only to suggest as a form of government "that the Filipinos are not a nation, but a variegated assemblage of different tribes and peoples, and their loyalty is still of the tribal type. As to the intellectual capacities of the Filipinos, the commission is disposed to rate them high. But excepting in a limited number of people, these capacities have not been developed by education or experience. The masses of the people are uneducated. That intelligent public opinion on which popular government rests does not exist in the Philippines. And it cannot exist until education has elevated the masses, broadened their intellectual horizon and disciplined their faculty of judgment. And even then the power of self-government cannot be assured without considerable previous training and experience under the guidance and tutelage of an enlightened and liberal foreign power. For the bald fact is that the Filipinos have never had any experience in governing themselves."

One attempt had been made, the commission said, at setting up a civil government after the retirement of Spain from the islands. "In Negros Island the natives had adopted a local form of government, including a Congress, and had raised the American flag. They believed themselves capable of managing their own affairs, and asked for a battalion of troops to hold in check a mountain band of fanatics. The battalion was furnished, but the people proved themselves unable to carry out their programme owing to ill feeling among their own officials. The Americans remained popular. At the request of General Otis, a new and simplified scheme of government for the island, giving the people a large voice in their affairs, *but placing an American in full control*, was put into operation. It brought about satisfaction (to the American possibly), and public order is better in the island to-day than at any time during the last twenty years." Summing up, the commission says: "The flat failure of this attempt to establish an independent native government in Negros, conducted as it was under the most favorable circumstances, makes it apparent that here as well as in less favored provinces a large amount of American control is at present absolutely essential to a successful administration of public affairs."

Flat failure to give even one island in the archipelago any tolerable government except a military despotism is the acknowledged result of our first experiment in colonization on the new "imperial" policy. Sixty thousand American troops have been employed for a year in chasing natives and burning the houses and fields of a population that was unknown to the majority of Americans two years ago. The cost to this country cannot be less than a hundred millions. Every soldier on foreign service costs the American people fifteen hundred dollars a year, and there are now over sixty thousand in the Philippines. The whole annual revenue under the Spanish Government did not equal a tenth of the amount already spent by the Administration in its attempt to establish American rule on anti-American lines in the Philippines. The Spanish force which maintained peace before numbered less than ten thousand and cost about three millions annually, yet it did not need to reduce the country to a desert to preserve order—as even the Peace Commissioners admit.

A more grotesque if less bloody illustration of the folly of trying to establish American institutions by military despotism is yet to tell. It comes from Guam, the island in the Ladrones which had been seized as a useful coaling station more than eighteen months ago. There was no insurrection there. A population of a few thousands had been living in peace under the rule of a Spanish officer with a dozen of police before the war. The President deemed it necessary to "Americanize" them in the imperialist manner by appointing a Military Governor, with absolute power over their liberties and properties. This gentleman, a Captain Leary, set about his task in the spirit of a Turkish Pasha. He found nine Catholic priests employed in their ordinary duties among this Catholic population. The Governor ordered eight of them to be banished, as he thought their influence might be hostile to his own régime. There were neither charges nor trial, other than the captain's ukase. The treaty, signed by our Government with Spain, had guaranteed all Spaniards the right to remain in the ceded islands, and also full freedom of religion. The captain in the fullness of his authority treated the stipulations as beneath his notice and deported the priests, as likely to obstruct the "Americanization" of the country. What his own ideas of American institutions are may be learned from the sympathetic description of his reforms given by a correspondent of the New York *Tribune* on the 20th of November. The writer tells gravely that "Governor Leary, of Guam, is having novel experiences for an American in an altogether unique community. One of his recent reports gives a terse résumé of affairs in the captain's dominion. It shows that the islanders are inordinately lazy, having acquired the habit of raising only such crops as will keep their bodies and souls together, and that they cannot be *easily induced to value money* or *exercise their earning power.* The most interesting part of the report relates to *reforms* begun, of which the Governor says: 'Having disposed of the priests' reign, rapid progress was made and no further resistance will be encountered.' The first of these reforms is calculated to compel each adult native to contribute to the support of the government by engaging in food production. The order directs all who have no trade to plant cereals, vegetables, etc., under more or less severe penalties. It is stipulated that each citizen *shall have at least twelve hens, one sow and continue in possession of them indefinitely.* They must bring eggs, chickens and vegetables to sell to the Governor's house and barracks at stated intervals, and they must pay their taxes. The other order demands that concubinage, which was general all over the island, shall stop immediately." In this order Governor Leary moralizes as follows: "The existing custom of raising families of illegitimate children is repulsive to ideas of decency, antagonistic to moral advancement, incompatible with the generally recognized customs of civilized society, a violation of the accepted principles of Christianity and a most degrading injustice to the innocent offspring, who is not responsible for the conditions of his unfortunate existence."

This is not an extract from Sancho Panza's history in Barataria, but an actual statement of the rule introduced into a long settled island as American civilization. It is told in all serious admiration by an American newspaper correspondent as the doings in peace of the first Governor appointed by President McKinley. The final climax is added to finish the picture:

"The Governor, in conclusion, commanded immediate wedlock for the whole population, and made the license and civil ceremony free until November 3. As a result, the officers in charge of the licenses and marriages were worked half to death until nearly everybody on the island was legally married. There was a rush to obey the order, and in fact the people have shown a disposition to be obedient to any suggestion from their Governor."

If any exercise of despotic power like this is told in the Arabian Nights, we do not know of it. The supposed "general concubinage" which shocked the Governor is, it is needless to say, a figment of his own imagination. Similar stories were told of the Philippines a few months ago, though marriages are more numerous proportionately there than in any European country. Mr. Leary may hold a civil ceremony essential to valid marriage, but such is not the belief of Catholics, and the people of Guam are all Catholics. The audacious pretense to regulate the most intimate family relations by the ukase of a sea captain is unparalleled in the history of America. It is noteworthy that it is highly approved by the *Tribune* correspondent. Catholics of America may well ponder on this and ask how long will freedom of conscience be left to themselves if the new theory of establishing free institutions by military despotism is tolerated by the American people.

It would be childish in the face of this action of Captain Leary, which has as yet received no condemnation from our Administration, to say there is no danger of persecution of Catholics under American rule. Its likelihood seems much greater at the present moment than it would have been two years ago to believe that the sympathy in the sufferings of the Cuban "reconcentrados" expressed by the American press would end in the reign of terror among the Filipinos that has been just described. If any people, be it French, English or American, lets its government be guided by impulse of the moment, not principle, it is impossible to say what it may not attempt. The recent experience of Admiral Dewey, welcomed to New York as a hero by seven millions of American citizens and hissed in public a few weeks later, is a modern object lesson of what popular favor is worth in this country as in others. Two years ago it would have been a joke to suggest the extension of American principles of government to other islands by military despotism. We have seen the experiment tried in Guam and the Philippines, and few seem to find it strange to-day. Would the New York *Tribune* find a new Culturkampf in America against the Catholic Church here, if suggested by an American administration, materially different from the lawless expulsion of the Spanish friars from Guam, which its correspondent describes with such unctuous, if idiotic, approval?

There are a few cardinal principles on which the stability of government so long enjoyed by these United States rests. It is not republican institutions in theory alone. A dozen at least of other lands have equally perfect theoretical constitutions, yet cannot maintain peace within their boundaries. Those principles are that the will of the people, expressed by fixed methods of election, shall be supreme in naming the administrative and other rulers of the community; that the standing army shall be kept in such limits as shall preclude the risk of a military dictator overruling the civil order of law, and that the civil government shall not interfere in matters of religion among its citizens. The first and second have already been set aside in the Philippines, and that, too, on the pretense of extending American ideas there. The third has been flagrantly disregarded in Guam by an officer dependent for his petty authority entirely on the President of the United States. Its extension to the seven million Catholics of the Philippines has been unblushingly advocated in many quarters. The expulsion of the Catholic priests, who had been guaranteed the full right to remain there by solemn treaty, was urged before the Treaty Commissioners at Paris by an English adviser, who was deemed worthy of consultation by our Commissioners. The confiscation of the property, held for centuries, for the support of Catholic seminaries, colleges and charities is commonly called for by a section of the American press. Even a sober publication like the *Outlook*, of New York, asked lately for a court of law, properly constituted, "to get round the possessory titles" of the Catholic orders in the Philippines. It went on to add with frank ignorance of the existence of any law courts in the Spanish colonies "that possessory title is gained by what is known as 'adverse possession;' that it is well settled that such adverse possession must be actual, visible, notorious, distinct and hostile, and that it may well be doubted whether the courts (American) would hold that such a title had been gained in a country where notoriously there were no courts or processes by which the title could be contested." As the courts of Manila have been in existence for over three hundred years, the meaning of this astounding argument can only be that no rights of property have any existence in the islands. Confiscation thus would only be the exercise of the rights of an American Governor to seize Catholic Church property at will.

How ready a large number of Americans are to act on this theory, without even the formality of a court, has been only too clearly shown during the past year. Plunder of every kind taken from the churches built by Catholic piety in the Philippines has been carried through the country by the returning volunteers of the army of occupation. Chalices, vestments, paintings, bells, statues and crucifixes in thousands have been exhibited in the tents of the returned soldiers without any attempt on the part of the military authorities to interfere with the robberies. The Peace Commission calmly contented itself with dismissing the question, and other advocates openly maintained that no robbery had been done by American soldiers because "strict orders had been issued against plunder." Orders "issued" are apparently regarded as all the protection the Catholics of the Philippines have a right to expect under the new imperialism. In the same way the treaty with Spain assured the right of all Spanish residents to reside in the ceded islands. Therefore the eight priests exiled from Guam by Captain Leary had no grounds for complaint. This, indeed, is Cromwell come again. "I meddle with no man's conscience, but I will not permit the Mass where the English Parliament rules."

The danger that some American Catholics may let themselves be hoodwinked as to the real meaning of this threatened attack on their religion in the Philippines is a most serious one. It has been shown by numerous utterances in the press. At the beginning of last year the New York *Herald* professed to give "a prominent Catholic clergyman" of that city as saying:

"If the islands are to be held by the United States, it is to be expected they will be placed under the hierarchy of the United States. The Government will not look with favor on the proposition *to allow the Spanish priests to remain* in power and office in these islands. While they are cordially disliked and even hated by a large body of the natives, they are still very influential and *their presence* there would be *a constant menace* to the interests of this country and *a hindrance to the work of Americanizing* the islands."

If the author of this statement be really a Catholic priest, he must have forgotten everything of Catholic rights in his anxiety for Americanizing the islands, whatever that may mean. Is the presence of Catholic priests among a Catholic people dependent on the favor of Government or is it a right of conscience? We heard a good deal of native Americanism and similar phrases in former years in this country, but it is strange, indeed, to find a Catholic describing the Catholic influence of the priests who have formed the Catholic population of the Philippines as a menace to American interests. The English Government, after its failure to root out the faith of the Irish people by the penal laws, endeavored to secure a veto on the nomination of the Irish Bishops from the Holy See. That attempt was baffled by the determination of the Irish Catholics in 1814. It was felt that any favor of a non-Catholic Government in politics or any support for the clergy would not compensate for the danger of its interference in the choice of spiritual guides. It looks as if a veto on the appointment of Catholic Bishops and priests, too, in the Philippines is being thought of as a development of the new imperialism. We do not believe that the Catholics of America can or will tolerate a subjection of their Church to the policy of the Administration at Washington any more than the Irish Catholics of the days of George III. would permit the veto to an English monarch.

The expulsion of the Spanish priests from the Philippines would mean that nearly six millions of Catholics should be deprived of the means of divine worship. It would leave them absolutely without the moral guidance which, during ten generations, they have been accustomed to receive from their priests during the whole course of their lives. When the American fleet entered Manila Bay the whole clergy of the country numbered little over two thousand.

Thirteen hundred, or two-thirds, belonged to the religious orders, and this thirteen hundred had the spiritual guidance of five and a half millions of Catholics. Baptisms, marriages, administration of the other sacraments, the celebration of Mass and other divine services, instruction in the Christian doctrine and the moral conduct of life were all supplied for that population by the friars whom it is so lightly proposed to expel, lest they might be a "hindrance to Americanization" of the people raised from barbarism to civilization by their labors and those of their predecessors in the same orders. Of the secular clergy about one-half are of Spanish birth. If they, too, had to be sacrificed, there would remain about four hundred priests of Filipino race to minister to a population larger than the Dominion of Canada. What the result would be may be guessed from the state of Negros and Panay as told by the Peace Commission and American correspondents in preceding pages. It would in all likelihood be the utter demoralization of the mass of the Philippine people.

The duty of Catholic citizens in this matter is clear. The people are sovereign by law, at least as yet, in these United States. Every citizen has a share in that sovereignty and is responsible for his exercise of it. It is at election time that this sovereign power can be used by the citizen of the United States without any superior but his own conscience. He must, then, clear his conscience as the Dominican missioners of San Domingo called on the Spanish King to clear his conscience of injustice to the Indians. For persecution directed against the Church of God no Catholic can give his aid without practical apostasy. To any violation of the American Constitution or any policy which sets justice and humanity aside he is bound in conscience to offer resistance to the fullest of his powers as a citizen. There can be no middle course. If the honored name of American liberty or the shelter of the American flag is given by faithless administrators of government of any grade, to rapine or slaughter or to war on the rights of conscience, every Catholic voter, every honest citizen of any creed is bound, as far as his power goes, to prevent such maladministration. It is a sworn duty to uphold the Constitution of our country and to obey its laws in all not contrary to conscience. It is a higher duty to follow the law of God for man as taught by his own Church or imprinted on the human heart by natural reason. We trust that this duty will not be forgotten by any Catholic.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco.

THE RELIGION OF SHAKESPEARE.

THE question of Shakespeare's religion has been much discussed. The most recent contribution to this department of Shakespearean literature is the learned and scholarly volume, entitled "The Religion of Shakespeare," which we owe to the pen of Father Sebastian Bowden, the distinguished London Oratorian. Father Bowden has made it clear that Rationalism can lay little claim to Shakespeare and Protestantism even less, and that, if Shakespeare's religion may be gathered from his writings the evidence is all in favor of his having been a Catholic.

We say, if Shakespeare's religion may be gathered from his writings, for it is on this kind of evidence that Father Bowden chiefly relies. Father Bowden does not indeed neglect what he calls "external evidence." He shows that Shakespeare's mother was a Catholic. He gives good reason for believing that Shakespeare's father was a Catholic, and, in this connection, upholds with considerable ingenuity and force the genuineness of the Catholicly worded "last will and testament" that has been ascribed to John Shakespeare. He argues, as he reasonably may, that if Shakespeare's parents were both Catholics, the inference must be, until the contrary is proved, that Shakespeare himself was a Catholic. He shows that the contrary has never been proved, that there is no evidence whatever of a satisfactory kind of the poet's acceptance of the new religion. He points out that tradition is in favor of Shakespeare's Catholicism. He quotes in testimony to this the declaration of the Rev. Richard Davies, who, writing in the latter part of the seventeenth century, asserts that Shakespeare "died a Papist."

That external evidence of this kind carries with it considerable weight is acknowledged by such critics as the Rev. Professor Shuttleworth, who, in an address delivered at St. Nicholas Cole Abbey on April 23, 1899, admitted that "a strong argument in favor of his (Shakespeare's) Catholicism was the fact that his mother belonged to one of the oldest and most famous Catholic families in England—the Ardens of Warwickshire—some of whose members had figured as martyrs for that creed." Another well-known Shakespearean critic, Mr. Halliwell Phillipps, remarking on the statement of the Rev. Richard Davies that Shakespeare "died a Papist," points out that the statement represents the local tradition of the latter half of the seventeenth century, and is "the testimony of a sober clergyman who could have had no conceivable motive for deception in what is evidently the casual note of a provincial hearsay."

But while Father Bowden gives due weight to the external evidence, he finds in Shakespeare's writings the most convincing proofs of the poet's Catholicism. It would be impossible for us in the course of a short paper to set forth Father Bowden's arguments in detail. All that we can attempt is to indicate the lines on which his arguments proceed. We limit ourselves to the inquiry whether the religion with which Shakespeare in his writings shows his sympathies is the religion of the so-called Reformers, or the religion of the Catholic Church. If it can be shown that all Shakespeare's sympathies were with the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church, it will follow that Shakespeare was no Rationalist, and thus we may omit any reference to the direct arguments by which Father Bowden has convincingly shown the futility of the attempts made by Professor Caird and other recent writers to claim Shakespeare for Rationalism.

What had the so-called Reformers abolished? The Sacrifice of the Mass, the sacraments of the Holy Eucharist, Penance and Extreme Unction, Purgatory and prayers for the dead, the homage paid to Our Lady and the saints, the intercession of saints, the veneration of relics and holy images, the sign of the cross, vestments, satisfactory works, meritorious works, celibacy, the religious state with its three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. All these had been abolished by the "Reformers," and they were all reëstablished by Shakespeare, who speaks of them and of other beliefs and practices of the Catholic Church, as Father Bowden has shown, in a spirit of the profoundest reverence. Indeed we marvel at the *audacity* (there is no other word for it) with which Shakespeare pays open reverence to these proscribed beliefs and practices. Dr. Stubbs, the Dean of Ely, might well say, as he did when preaching the Shakespeare anniversary sermon, in the Collegiate Church of Holy Trinity, Stratford on Avon, on April 23, 1899, that there were "some things in Shakespeare for which, had he been a theologian, he might have been burned."

Compare man as viewed by the "Reformers" with man as viewed by Shakespeare, and (1) in respect to his nature. In the words of the authorized Lutheran Confession of Faith, man is characterized by the "intimate, profound, inscrutable and irreparable corruption of his entire nature, and of all his powers, especially of the superior and principal powers of his soul." (Solida Declaratio I., 31.) How does that compare with: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason; how infinite in faculties! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God!" (Hamlet II., 2.) (2) In respect to free will and responsibility. According to Luther, man, in regard to the work of his salvation, is "like the statue of salt into which Lot's wife was turned; like to a trunk or a stone, having the use neither of eyes, nor mouth, nor any of the senses, nor of the heart." (In Genes. cxix.) But with Shakespeare man is free and responsible. His conscience is as a lamp to his feet. He may follow its guiding light, but he is not constrained to do so. If he do follow, peace and blessing are his portion. If he refuse to follow, his soul is rent by remorse and fear. (3) In respect to grace. *Sanctifying* grace, with the "Reformers," was little more than a name. The sinner, in their teaching, was justified extrinsically only, and in consequence of his faith. Once a sinner, always intrinsically a sinner. *Actual* grace, in their teaching, was irresistible. In the illustration of Luther, the soul is like to a mule, and is now ridden by God, now ridden by the devil. Its rider always determines its course. When actual grace is given, God is riding the mule, and the mule *must* go as God is directing. With Shakespeare, on the other hand, as appears from Father Bowden's pages, *sanctifying* grace is no mere extrinsic denomination, but a state or habit of the soul, an inherent, supernatural quality of the soul. *Actual* grace has no necessitating force. It may be accepted or set aside. And, like sanctifying grace, it is not the effect of *fides fiducialis,* but is won by earnest prayer.

Compare Shakespeare and the "Reformers" in their respective views on philosophy. Any abuse that the "Reformers" could spare from the friars and nuns they showered upon the philosophy of the schools. Wicliffe, "the Morning Star of the Reformation," had called the schools the "camps of Cain." Luther, improving on this, had called them "the unclean houses (lupanaria) of anti-Christ." Calvin, who was never to be outdone in amenities, called the great scholastic doctors "horned asses," "two-legged beasts," etc., etc. But, with Shakespeare, Aristotle is a name to be held in high honor. And when he manifests his mind upon such important points of philosophy as, *e. g.*, the genesis of knowledge, the nature of knowledge and its claims to objectivity, the formation of habits intellectual and moral, the claim of the will to freedom, the root of the distinction between man and brute, his views are always scholastic.

Certain critics, unable to deny the appreciative spirit in which Shakespeare writes of the beliefs and customs of the Old Religion, have endeavored to explain away the significance of this by asserting that the stage in Shakespeare's day was free from religious rancor. This explanation is at once inadequate and inaccurate. (1) It is inadequate. The mere absence of bigotry might account for a neutral attitude on the poet's part. But it could never account for the intense sympathy which Shakespeare everywhere manifests with Catholic rites and doctrines. It would account for his not describing Confession as, in the elegant words of Luther, "a most bloody torture" (cruentissima carnificina); but it would not account for his laying stress on the consolation and peace which the Sacrament of Penance affords. It would account for his refraining from ribald stories concerning monks and nuns; but it would not account for his holding up monks and nuns as models of conscientiousness and purity. (2) The explanation is not simply inadequate; it is positively false. The truth is, as Father Bowden has shown, that the stage in Shakespeare's day was the arena for fierce religious controversy. In 1589, shortly after Shakespeare's arrival in London, the Puritans and Prelatists were reviling each other, in plays written in the interests of their respective parties, with such rigor that Harte, the Mayor of London, felt obliged, in the interests of the public peace, to intervene. But there was no Mayor, or other official, to intervene in the interests of the Catholics, and, in a rapid succession of plays, they were slandered and lampooned with impunity. George Peele, in his "Farewell to the Famous and Fortunate Generals of Our English Forces" (1589), invites Norris and Drake to lead their armies "to lofty Rome, and there deface the power of anti-Christ, and pull his paper walls and popery down." Lodge and Greene, in their jointly written play, the "Looking Glass for London" (1591), call upon London to repent of its sins, lest, in punishment, it fall again under the dominion of "Romish anti-Christ." In Greene's "Maiden's Dream" (1593), Sir Christopher Hatton is held up to admiration because "He hated anti-Christ and all his trash, and was not led away by superstitions." Marlowe in his "Faustus" (1593), exhibits at length the superstition, luxury and mummery of the Pope, and of the "bald pate friars whose *summum bonum* is belly cheer;" and in his "Massacre of Paris" (1593) the same poet represents the Pope as ratifying whatever is done by murder and tyranny, and the Duke of Guise as declaring that he has a "Papal dispensation" for the murder of all Protestants, which is to be effected by 30,000 friars and monks from the monasteries, priories, abbeys and halls. Marston's "Scourge of Villainy" sets before us "peevish Papists" crouching and kneeling to "dumb idols," and enlarges upon the "monstrous filth" of Douai Seminary. Dekker, in the introduction to his "Whore of Babylon" (1600), informs us that the purpose of his play is to set forth "the inveterate malice, treasons, machinations, underminings and continual bloody stratagems of the purple whore of Rome." Other instances of this kind might easily be given; but we think that proof sufficient has already been furnished that in the works of Shakespeare's contemporary dramatists the bitterness and rancor of Protestant bigotry was aggressively manifest. In the writings of Shakespeare, on the other hand, there is not a single word in disrespect of the ancient Church, its beliefs, its practices, or its institutions. Shakespeare does indeed use the expression which gives the title to Dekker's play; but only to place it in the mouth of the dissolute, drunken Falstaff, as he tosses on his death bed without a word of prayer, or a single token of repentance. Shakespeare, instead of assailing the Church, defended it, as we have already said. Candid Protestant critics have admitted this. "In an age," writes Mr. Knight (Biography of Shakespeare, p. 183), "when the prejudices of the multitude were flattered and stimulated by abuse and ridicule of the ancient ecclesiastical character, Shakespeare always exhibits it so as to command respect and affection."

Not only did Shakespeare carefully refrain from introducing anything anti-Catholic into his original compositions, but he further rigorously eliminated all the anti-Catholic elements from the plays which he remodeled. One of the plays remodeled by him was "The Troublesome Reign of King John." The aim of this scurrilous production was to glorify Protestantism and vilify the ancient faith. As Shakespeare was well aware, all that he needed to do in order to secure the popularity of his adaptation was to retain, or better still, to emphasize its furious attacks on the Church, and its ribald stories of monks and nuns. But Shakespeare instead of retaining or emphasizing acted as though he were a censor appointed by the Church. In the original play, when the sentence of his excommunication is made known to him, John contemptuously replies: "So, sir, the more the fox is curst, the better it fares; if God bless me and my land, let the Pope and his shavelings curse and spare not." A *censor deputatus* would never let that pass. So Shakespeare strikes it out. In the original play John threatens to "rouse the lazy lubbers (the monks) from their cells and send them as prisoners to the Pope." Thunders of applause must have greeted these words when spoken before an Elizabethan audience. But Shakespeare runs his pen through them, all the same. The original play gives expression to the current calumny that, according to Catholic teaching, an oath "made with a heretic" has no binding force. Shakespeare not only strikes this out, but is careful also to substitute in its stead, and place in Pandulph's mouth, a detailed and elaborate disquisition on the nature of an oath, in complete accordance with the Church's genuine teaching on the subject. In the original play John, after his victory over the French, hurls jeers and invectives at "the mischievous Priest in Italy, who calls himself God's Vicar," and is now hard at work with Dirges, Octaves and Requiems to assuage the flames of Purgatory for those who have fallen in battle, and covers with abuse those princes "who formerly bore the yoke of the servile priest." All this is carefully suppressed by Shakespeare. In the original play there were certain filthy cloister scenes. According to Gervinus these abominable scenes, with their vile and slanderous attacks on monks and nuns, were "certainly very amusing to the fresh Protestant feelings of the time." No doubt they were; but Shakespeare did not permit a single line of them to remain. In the original play Pandulph, the Papal Legate, is represented as a hypocrite, a crafty, double-dealing, unscrupulous politician. But in Shakespeare's "King John" he appears as an experienced, far-sighted, broad-minded statesman, and a true ghostly father withal, full of sympathy for the afflicted. In the original play a compliment is paid to Henry VIII. John declares that his sins have made him unworthy to fulfil the exalted task of driving "Pope and Poperie" from the realm of England, but that one day a king will be raised up great and good enough to receive so noble a commission. Shakespeare quietly put his pen through this. In the original play the prophecy of the Five Moons is given an anti-Papal interpretation. In Shakespeare's "King John" it is stripped of this interpretation. In the original play John is defiant to the last, and dies cursing Rome and prophesying its downfall. In Shakespeare's "King John" the King dies desolate and despairing. Was there ever a more careful *censor deputatus* than Shakespeare proved himself to be? But we must admit an apparent exception to the general vigilance of his censorship. When Pandulph, as Legate of Pope Innocent III., called King John to account for refusing to permit Archbishop Langton to take possession of his See of Canterbury, and for appropriating the revenues of that see, the King bade the Legate inform the Pope "that no Italian priest shall tithe or toil in our dominion; but, as we under heaven are supreme head, so, under Him, that Great Supremacy, where we do reign, we will alone uphold, without the assistance of a mortal hand: So tell the Pope, all reverence apart to him and his usurp'd authority." (King John III., 1.) This speech, which is undoubtedly a very bitter one, has been often quoted in anti-Catholic declamations by Prime Ministers, Lord Chancellors and Archbishops in our own times. But the question is whether this bitter speech really represents the mind of Shakespeare. Many critics, as might have been expected, have asserted that it does, and, all other proofs failing, have pointed triumphantly to these lines as a convincing proof of Shakespeare's Protestantism. But these critics, as Father Bowden has pointed out, have been somewhat overhasty in reaching their conclusion. To discover a dramatist's mind it is not sufficient to consider the sentiments that he expresses; we must further consider the mouth through which he expresses him. We may lawfully seek the poet's ideal in the character which he draws on heroic lines; but we surely do him an injustice if we seek for his ideal in the "villain of the piece." King John speaks the words in question. Now what manner of man is John as he appears in Shakespeare's play? Does the poet portray him as a hero, or does he portray him as a villain? He portrays him most emphatically as a villain. "John," says the Protestant critic Kreysig, quoted by Father Bowden, "begins as an ordinary and respectable man of the world, and he ends as an ordinary criminal; he is not only a villain, but a mean villain. The satanic grandeur of an Edmund or a Macbeth is wholly beyond him." (Vorlesungen I., 462.) But not only was John, in Shakespeare's delineation, "a villain, and a mean villain;" he was further an unsuccessful villain. All his curses recoiled upon himself. His bold defiance to the Pope proved to be nothing more than mere sound and fury. He ended by eating his own words. He humbled himself to the dust before the Legate, and as a penitent received again his crown from the Legate's hands, and his kingdom in fief from the Pope. The anti-Catholic speeches then which Shakespeare places in the mouth of King John no more prove that Shakespeare was a Protestant than the words "There is no God," which David represents the fool as saying "in his heart" prove that David was a skeptic.

Shakespeare does indeed manifest his scorn for one form of religion. But that religion was not the Catholic. It was the religion which strove to oust the Catholic religion; the religion which cast aside authority and scoffed at tradition; which bade every man take the Bible and interpret it for himself. Professors of this religion find their place in Shakespeare's pages. Jack Cade and his followers, Costard and Holofernes, Quince and Bottom; but, above all, Falstaff—such are the representatives of the "reformed" doctrine, as they appear in the writings of Shakespeare. Father Bowden is of opinion that, in the character of Falstaff, Shakespeare was portraying Sir John Oldcastle, otherwise known as Lord Cobham, the notorious Lollard leader whom Bale and Fox had canonized as a Protestant martyr. There is certainly a striking resemblance between Oldcastle and Falstaff. In both of them we find sanctimoniousness and the habit of quoting Scripture on the one hand, and obscenity and depravity on the other. Indeed, Shakespeare would seem to have given his audience something more than a hint that Falstaff was drawn from Oldcastle, for Prince Henry styles Falstaff in almost the first words that he addresses to him, "My *old* lad of the *castle*," and these words supplied the title under which the play was first produced. But, whether Shakespeare intended to portray Oldcastle in Falstaff or not, there can be no doubt that the public accredited him with this intention, and in November, 1599, a play, written by Anthony Munday in collaboration with others, and entitled "The History of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham," was put on the stage with the view to rehabilitating Oldcastle in popular esteem. The words of the prologue, "It is no hampered glutton we present, nor aged counsellor to youthful sin; let fair truth be graced, since forged invention former time defaced," are an evident allusion to Shakespeare's description of Falstaff: "That villainous, abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan," and the delineation that it is supposed to contain of Lord Cobham. But whether Falstaff stood for Oldcastle or not, the professors of the "reformed" religion met with scant courtesy from Shakespeare, who drew his ideal expounders of religion from the representatives of the ancient faith. This is acknowledged even by Protestant critics. Thus Mr. Thornbury, whom Father Bowden describes as "a very strong Protestant," writes: "To judge from Sir Oliver Martext and Sir Hugh Evans, the parish priests (Protestant) of Shakespeare's day were no very shining lights, and the poet seems to fall back, as in 'Romeo and Juliet' and 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona,' on the ideal priest of an earlier age. It is indeed true that he always mentions the old faith with a certain yearning fondness." (Shakespeare's England, Vol. I., p. 211.) Shakespeare does indeed utter a reproach against Cardinal Beaufort, and his picture of Wolsey is far from a favorable one. But his reproach against Beaufort is one that any Catholic might have lawfully made, while his portrait of Wolsey is actually copied from the description given of the famous Cardinal by B. Edmund Campion, the first Jesuit martyr, in his "History of Ireland." Of Shakespeare's treatment of Pandulph we have already spoken. The remaining Catholic prelates whom Shakespeare put on the stage were, in the words of the Protestant critic Thummel, "recruited from the highest houses in England, and represent a stately array of political lords in priestly robes, of noble descent, true priests and Englishmen to the backbone." (Tahrbuch, 16, 361.)

Once Shakespeare does seem to be leading up to an attack on the Church. "The world is deceived by ornament," he makes Bassanio to say. Bassanio speaks first of ornament as deceiving in the law, and then turns to ornament as deceiving in religion. Surely here at least can come no attack on the "Reformers." Whoever accused the spoilers of churches, the whitewashers of mural decorations, the renders of vestments, the melters of ecclesiastical vessels of gold and silver of excessive love of ornament in religion? Surely now will come an onslaught on vestments, incense, lights, processions and the like papist trumperies and mummeries. Yet, once again, not the gorgeous ceremonial of the Catholic Church, but the Protestant treatment of the Bible is the object of Shakespeare's scorn. "In religion," continues Bassanio, "what damned error, but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a test, hiding the grossness with fair ornament."

What were the themes which Shakespeare chose? Protestants might celebrate, as Bale and Spencer did, the downfall of the Papal supremacy; or, like Ben Jonson, the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot; or, like Dekker, the destruction of the Armada; or might sing, like Fletcher, the glories of Elizabeth. But Shakespeare has not a single word to say on these subjects. His muse is almost exclusively occupied with the men and women, and the spirit and temper of Catholic times.

Where does Shakespeare find his heroes. We know where the "Reformers" found theirs. They found them in King John, in "bluff King Hal," in "good Queen Bess." Shakespeare writes of John and Henry. We have seen what John was in Shakespeare's delineation—"a villain, and a mean villain," with all his curses on the Pope recoiling on his own head. How does Shakespeare write of Henry VIII.? Had Fletcher, Munday, Marlowe or any other Protestant dramatist written on such a theme, the "Reformation" would have been set before us as the heroic act of Henry's reign, and Catherine and her daughter Mary would suffer by contrast with Anne Boleyn and Elizabeth. But Shakespeare's treatment of the subject is the very opposite to this. Shakespeare exposes the Tudor tyranny in its worst features. He excites all our sympathy in behalf of the pious Catholic Queen, "whose afflictions, virtues and patience," says Mr. Spedding, "he elaborately exhibits," and arouses all our indignation at the shameless wrong that has been done her. Henry he represents as a melodramatic, pretentious, arrogant, oily hypocrite. He scoffs again and again at Henry's "conscience," that conscience which had divorced a lawful wife, married an adultress and forced upon an unwilling nation the curse of the "Reformation." One who scoffed at the "conscience" which had divorced Queen Catherine, and celebrated with all his matchless power the virtues of that deposed Queen, was clearly not the man to sing the glories of Elizabeth. And, in truth, when Elizabeth died, Shakespeare alone of the contemporary poets and dramatists refused to compose a single line in honor of her memory. Chettle taxed him with this. "Nor doth the silver-tongued mellicent drop from his honeyed muse one subtle tear to mourn her death." But Shakespeare obstinately remained silent.

Shakespeare's ideal Prince is King Henry V. And this ideal Prince of his, this man whom he would set before the world as the great national hero of England, he draws as a devout Catholic. Of the King's piety Shakespeare leaves us in no doubt. "We are in God's hands, brother, not in theirs," remarks Henry when the Duke of Gloster has expressed his apprehension lest the French should attack at a moment when the English were unprepared. Henry warns a private soldier whom he meets by chance, and who is unaware that he is speaking with the King, that a soldier in the wars should, like a sick man on his bed, "wash every mote from his conscience;" thus prepared "death is to him advantage." Before the fight commences Henry invokes the aid of heaven. When the victory is gained he gives the glory to God. "Praised be God, and not our strength for it," he cries, when first he hears that the field is won. And when he later learns how complete the victory has been, he prays: "O God, Thy arm was here; and not to us, but to Thy arm alone ascribe we all. . . . Take it, God, for it is only Thine." And then he proclaims as the order of the day: "Do we all holy rites; let there be sung 'Non nobis' and 'Te Deum.'" In the same spirit of humility, Henry refused the request of the lords that he should have borne before him "his bruised helmet and his bended sword," on his triumphant entry through the streets of London; for he was ever "free from vainness and self-glorious pride, giving full glory, signal and ostent, quite from himself to God." And this devoutly-minded King, this "mirror of Christian knights" is depicted by Shakespeare as an earnest and fervent Catholic.

Before the battle of Agincourt he implores God not, when deciding what shall be the issue of the contest, to think of his father's complicity in the murder of Richard II., but to think rather of the measures which he himself has taken to expiate his father's crime. He provides from year to year for five hundred aged poor who "twice a day their withered hands hold up towards heaven to pardon blood;" and he has built two chantries "where the sad and solemn priests sing still for Richard's soul." "These two foundations," writes Father Bowden, "were situated on the opposite banks of the Thames. That on the Surrey shore at Sheene was given to the Carthusians. The other, Sion House, facing it on the Middlesex shore, was bestowed on Bridgettine nuns."

On the supposition that a dramatist's views may be gathered from his writings, we may confidently say that Father Bowden has proved to demonstration that Shakespeare's sympathies were entirely with the beliefs and practices of the ancient faith. But may we make this supposition? Some of the non-Catholic reviewers of Father Bowden's work, seeing clearly that, if the supposition be admitted, Father Bowden's conclusion must remain incontestable, have denied his right to make the supposition. A dramatist, they argued, speaks only in character, and his writings are, in consequence, no index to his personal views. The answer to this contention is manifold. (1) It is quite in accordance with custom to judge of a dramatist's views on life and religion from the manner in which he expresses himself on these all important subjects in his writings. The personal beliefs and inmost convictions of all great dramatists from Eschylus to Milton (for Milton's greater poems are, in truth, dramas) have been discussed in the past, and are still the subject of discussion, though the data of this discusssion are taken, in most cases, from their dramas alone. (2) There are not a few critics at the present day, like Professor Dowden, Professor Caird and Mr. Tyler, in England, and Kreysig and Dr. Vehse, in Germany, who profess to prove from Shakespeare's dramas that Shakespeare was a Rationalist. If, then, it be lawful to argue from the writings of dramatists generally to the religious beliefs of the dramatists themselves, why are we to make an exception in the case of Shakespeare? And if it be lawful to attempt to prove from Shakespeare's writings that Shakespeare was a Rationalist, why is it not lawful from those same writings to attempt to prove that Shakespeare was a Catholic? (3) Father Bowden, in his inquiry, has been guided throughout by the canon of criticism laid down by Aristotle to the effect that we are, when endeavoring to ascertain a dramatist's views, to consider not simply what the dramatist says, but also the character by which he says it. The reasonableness of this rule is apparent. The language and action of a hero may be supposed to represent the poet's type of what is good and noble, and therefore of what he would wish his own language and action to be. The sentiments of a scoundrel, on the other hand, are intentionally drawn as false, base and treacherous, and therefore presumably not those of the poet's ideal self. Now, though Shakespeare may place anti-Catholic sentiments in the mouth of one portrayed by him as "not only a villain, but a mean villain," like King John, he is careful to draw those characters whom he evidently reveres and loves as devout and earnest Catholics. We have been able to present Father Bowden's arguments only in their broad, general lines. For the full elaboration of these arguments we refer our readers to Father Bowden's interesting and scholarly volume.

William L. Gildea.

London.

THE YEAR OF JUBILEE.

A JUBILEE, or Holy Year, is a year in which a Plenary Indulgence is granted to all who visit certain churches, and perform certain good works, with proper dispositions, and Confessors receive extraordinary powers with regard to absolution in reserved cases, and censures, and in the commutation of vows.

Several reasons for the institution of the Holy Year are given by the Popes in their Constitutions: the compassion of Mother Church offering a remedy to those who are oppressed by sin, to stir up and renew the devotion of the faithful, to venerate SS. Peter and Paul by frequent visits to their basilicas, and to honor the city, Mother, Mistress and Head of all the Churches, which is consecrated by the tombs of the two Apostles and the blood of so many martyrs.

The Jubilee of the Christian Church has a parallel in the observance prescribed in Leviticus (ch. xxv.), "Thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of the land: for it is the year of Jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, and every one shall go back to his former family." The Mosaic Jubilee was announced by sound of trumpet, for it came laden with redemption to all, debtors were relieved, and those who had been forced in the straits of poverty to sell their land resumed possession. Just as the Hebrews received, every fifty years, restitution of mortgages; as the debts of their poor were cancelled and slaves were set at liberty, so the faithful in the year of Jubilee obtain remission of the penalty of their offenses by the Indulgence, and those who are in the bonds of sin are freed through the merits of Christ.

In the Divine economy man's instruction in spiritual and invisible mysteries is conveyed to him by visible and material signs: the wisdom of God condescending to his capacity, to lift him up, by the help of figures and symbols to a comprehension of the august realities. What were the sacrifices and ritual observances of the Old Law but aids to human intelligence, confined in its ken by sense and matter, giving expression to spiritual thoughts in visible and material actions? The Church, God's vicarious Teacher, does not neglect this method. The institution of the Holy Year and the rites that solemnize it, like all the ceremonies of her liturgy, are material symbols that speak to the senses, but raise the soul into the region of spirit.

The characteristic ceremony which distinguishes the Holy Year is the opening and shutting of the *Porta Santa*, or Holy Door. It was suggested by the ordinance appointed for the Jews in Ezechiel (ch. xlvi.), "The gate of the inner court, that looketh toward the east, shall be shut the six days, on which work is done, but on the Sabbath Day it shall be opened, yea and on the day of the new moon it shall be opened."

The Porta Santa is one of the five doors of the basilica of St. Peter, and of the three other Patriarchal basilicas, St. Paul, St. John Lateran and St. Mary Major, which is only opened during the year of the Jubilee and walled up till the next. The ceremony with which it is opened and shut is a link with the ancient discipline of the Church dealing with penitents. At the beginning of Lent it was the custom solemnly to exclude from participation in the sacred mysteries, and even from the church's precincts, those who by the canons were subject to public penance. On Good Friday, if duly repentant, they were absolved, and admitted again to communion with the faithful. The Jubilee rite indicates the opening and closing of the Church's spiritual treasury, the satisfaction and merits of the Redeemer, from whose bounty pardon of sin and remission of punishment are dispensed to those who qualify themselves, by fulfilling the prescribed conditions, to receive the indulgence of the Holy Year.

It is sometimes said that the observance of the Holy Year, or Jubilee, was a contrivance of the Papal Court to bring, with a concourse from all parts of the world, an increase to its exchequer. So far was the first institution of the Jubilee from being an invention of the Popes, that the proclamation of the first historically authenticated Jubilee by Boniface VIII. cannot be described as a spontaneous act of that Pontiff. At Christmas of the year 1299 Rome was invaded by extraordinary crowds from places far and near, who came to visit the Basilica of St. Peter, and on the first day of the new year they arrived in still greater numbers, all full of hope to obtain some great indulgence and spiritual favors they had heard of and were led to expect. For two months this concourse continued to increase, and Pope Boniface was induced to order search to be made in the Church's registers for any trace of a grant to justify the popular expectation. Nothing could be discovered; even if a document ever existed, its loss was not to be wondered at in the perpetual wars of foreign enemies and the troubles of domestic faction. Tradition was investigated, and the evidence of the oldest living, whose fathers had been alive a hundred years before. Nonagenarians were found to certify that they had heard from their parents who had come as pilgrims to Rome at the beginning of the century that at every hundredth year Indulgences were to be gained by visiting the Churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, but nothing could be ascertained as to the nature or extent of the privileges claimed; on this, testimony was not concurrent.

It was then that Boniface, after consulting his Cardinals, issued the famous Bull of 22 February, 1300, in which he implicitly sanctioned the tradition, and determined the conditions for gaining the spiritual favors. To all the faithful, who during the year 1300, or on each hundredth year following, should visit the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul on thirty different days, if resident in Rome; or fifteen days, if pilgrims or strangers, he grants a Plenary Indulgence. This decree may therefore be regarded as the revival and solemn ratification of a traditional persuasion of the Christian people, based on their practical faith in the power of the Keys, and the Headship of Rome, and testified to from the earliest times by pilgrimages of laymen and churchmen, of noble and simple, made to the tomb of Peter.

The publication of the Bull at this critical period was most opportune. Civil faction, the political revolutions in Italy and the turbulent ambition of foreign invaders who aimed at domineering over the Church, had been bringing discredit on Religion, sapping the popular faith and multiplying excesses and crimes.

The announcement of the Jubilee drew to Rome extraordinary multitudes from every part of Christendom. Giovanni Villani, who was present, says that during the year there was a continuous population of 200,000 souls, and in the course of twelve months two millions were calculated to have arrived. Among these Charles of Valois, brother of Philip le Bel, with his wife Catharine, came accompanied by a suite of five hundred knights. It has been conjectured, and not without reason, that the poet Dante came to Rome on this occasion, and that in his allusion to the crowds passing over the bridge of S. Angelo in two streams, one directed to St. Peter's, the other returning to the city, he is describing what he saw:

> As when the Romans (because all too vast
> Their multitude, the year of Jubilee)
> The bridge in twofold line and order pass'd;
> And, thus divided, on one side they see
> The castle, and towards St. Peter's go,
> And turn'd towards the mount the others be.[1]

It is also singular that the initial scene of his great poem is timed for Maundy Thursday, 1300. The subject of the "Divina Commedia," as Dante tells us in his dedication to Can Grande della Scala, is man in his relation to the Divine Justice, which dispenses reward or punishment according to the use made of his free will. It was composed with a deeply spiritual and ascetic purpose; in the poet's words, "to raise up those who are in this life from their condition of misery, and conduct them to a state of bliss."

---

[1] Dante, *Inferno*, xviii. Mrs. Ramsay's Translation.

The scope and purpose of the Holy Year is no other, and it would almost seem as if Dante had conceived the idea of his poem, when he was full of the impressions of the first Jubilee Year. Dante was certainly at Rome in the pontificate of Boniface, for he was one of five ambassadors sent to the Pope by the Guelphs of Florence.

The liberality of the Pontiff, aided by contributions from some Romans and the more wealthy of the pilgrims, provided lodging and food for all this multitude. Abundant alms for the entertainment of the poor, and for the restoration and embellishment of the churches, poured in. St. Peter's alone received fifty thousand gold florins, and St. Paul's thirty thousand. By the Pope's command a large portion of this money was invested in the purchase of castles and land as endowment for the basilicas, and till the present day the memory of those donations has been preserved in the name "Castel Giubileo," given to a domain ten miles from Rome, still part of the patrimony of St. Peter's.

The second Jubilee was promulgated in a time of desolation for Rome. For forty years the Popes had been holding splendid court at Avignon, and the Eternal City, abandoned to itself, was reduced to a state of extreme squalor. An earthquake had laid part in ruins, grass grew in St. Peter's, its bell tower was cast down, the Lateran was roofless, disaster menaced St. Paul's, the Liberian Basilica had suffered severely. A pestilence succeeded the earthquake and the Romans, in consternation, betook themselves to the churches and implored the divine mercy. They regarded their afflictions as a scourge for sin, and turned to the absent Pontiff for encouragement and help. The Pope then was Clement VI. An embassy headed by Stephen Colonna was dispatched to Avignon in 1342, and two years later another was sent conducted by Petrarch and Cola di Rienzi, then at the height of his fame and the popular favor. The eloquence of one envoy and the fascinating enthusiasm of the other appealed to the Pope. They besought him to restore the pontifical residence to Rome, and to raise it from its depression by anticipating the time for another Jubilee. Clement would not promise to bring back the Court, but he was so captivated by the young Tribune that he associated him with the Bishop of Orvieto in a commission to govern the Roman State till permanent provision was made. He agreed to anticipate the Holy Year, and issued a Bull stating that, in consideration of the brief span of human life, he abbreviated the interval fixed for the celebration of the Jubilee, reducing it from a hundred to fifty years. He added the Lateran to the churches to be visited by the pilgrims, reducing at the same time the number of visits to be made by strangers to eight. He deputed a Cardinal as Legate *a latere* to preside at the opening, appointed for the vigil of

Christmas, 1349. The Jubilee of 1350, notwithstanding the absence of the Papal Court, saw a greater concourse of pilgrims than the first. Matteo Villani, a contemporary, relates that at Pentecost nearly 800,000 persons were present in Rome. Louis of Bavaria came among the rest, and Rienzi offered him the protectorate of the Roman Republic, an honor which he declined out of reverence for the rights of the Church. St. Brigid of Sweden was also then in the city, where she had arrived with her daughter some years before to fix her home on soil sanctified by the blood of so many martyrs.

In 1371 Gregory XI. was elected Pope. Yielding to the representations and entreaties of St. Brigid and St. Catherine of Siena, and awed, perhaps, by a threat of the Romans to give themselves a Pope if he did not speedily come to reside with them himself, he resolved to set out. On January 17, 1377, he made his solemn entry into the city, received with unfeigned acclamation by the populace. He published no Jubilee, but to the number of churches to be visited for the indulgences he added St. Mary Major's.

In 1389 Pope Urban VI. further reduced the interval separating the Holy Years to thirty-three years, in memory of the reputed years of our Lord's life on earth, and fixed the year 1390 for the celebration of the next. He died before its opening, but his decree was carried out by his successor, Boniface IX. At this time an antipope divided the allegiance of Christendom, and his adherents in France and Spain abstained from taking part in the pilgrimage to Rome. Accordingly this was not so numerous as on previous occasions. Many, however, came from Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, England and other countries in the obedience of Boniface.

The year 1400 had been designated in the original Bull of Boniface VIII. as a Holy Year, and notwithstanding the subsequent changes decreed by other Popes, immense multitudes flocked to Rome, in expectation of the promised graces. But the Pope refused to open anew the treasures of the Church after such a short interval.

The fourth Jubilee was celebrated by Martin V. in 1423, after the space of thirty-three years prescribed by Urban VI. This time the pilgrims were less numerous than at the last. It was just at the close of the great schism which was healed by the election of Martin, and the renunciation or deposition of three contending claimants. It was this Pontiff who sternly rebuked the English Primate for presuming to arrogate the powers of the Vicar of Christ and proclaim a sort of Jubilee to all who visited his Cathedral Church at Canterbury.

If the last two Jubilees passed in comparative obscurity, this cannot be said of the next recurrence of the Holy Year. It was celebrated by Nicholas V. in 1450. The number of pilgrims far surpassed any of the former occasions. Many came to Rome, drawn by the fame of the Pope's personal holiness of life. He frequently took part in the processions of penance in the streets, often with bare feet. During this Jubilee, devotion to the Holy Face and its image, preserved in St. Peter's, received a great impulse. So eager was Frederic III., crowned King of the Romans and heir to the Imperial throne, to obtain a near view of the holy relic, that to enable him to enter the small chapel where it is kept he was made honorary canon of the chapter. It was on occasion of a solemn exposition of the Relic that a crowd returning from the Basilica, meeting another on its way to the church, on the bridge of S. Angelo, was thrown into panic which caused the death of two hundred persons.

Clearly the Popes, from what has been said, did not consider themselves tied by their predecessors to the intervals prescribed for holding the Jubilees, and the space of a hundred years was successively replaced by periods of fifty and thirty-three years. The last change, and it reduced the interval to twenty-five, still observed, was made by Paul II. in 1470. He issued a Bull in that year making this modification and proclaiming a Jubilee for 1475. He did not live to celebrate it, and the sixth Holy Year was solemnized by Sixtus IV.

It is in the Jubilee of Alexander VI. that we hear the first mention of the *Porta Santa*, or Holy Door, to be opened and shut with certain solemnities at the beginning and end of each Jubilee. Indeed most of the ceremonial attending the commencement and close of the years of Jubilee was established by this Pontiff. He directed that the announcement of the Jubilee was to be made three times in the previous year, but Julius III. limited the proclamations to two, fixed afterwards by Gregory XIII. for the Feast of the Ascension and the last Sunday in Advent. This regulation continues in force. Alexander VI. was the first to extend the privileges of the Jubilee to the whole Catholic world in the year following its celebration in Rome, on the fulfillment of certain conditions. Publishing the Jubilee for 1500 Alexander refers in his Bull to a "Door which is wont to be opened for the devotion of the faithful each hundredth Jubilee year." This, if it existed, must have been walled up by Boniface IX., but it could not be discovered by Alexander's workmen, although he himself superintended the search; and he ordered a new door to be prepared, decorated with marble and sculpture, easily recognized for future occasions.

The eighth Jubilee was celebrated under Clement VII. in 1525, the year in which Luther contracted his union with Catherine de

Bore. On account of the religious ferment and wars of the time the number of pilgrims to Rome was not remarkable.

The ninth Jubilee was published by Paul II. in 1549; but, through the vacancy of the See by his death in November, the inauguration was deferred till February 24, 1550, when it was performed by his successor, Julius III.

It was during this Holy Year that the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, "Trinità dei Pellegrini," first came into notice. It had been founded under another name two years before by St. Philip Neri's direction, for the advancement of its associates in piety and virtue and for mutual help. At the approach of the Jubilee this society began to interest itself on behalf of the poorer pilgrims who were to be expected, and rented a small house where beds were provided for ten or twelve persons. A lady then offered the use of another house for women. In these two hospices the brothers and sisters of the Confraternity welcomed foot-sore travelers on their arrival and ministered to their wants during their stay. The marvelous development of this institution and the services it rendered to the poor, in centuries to follow, will appear in the sequel.

One of the most memorable Jubilees was the tenth, under Gregory XIII., in 1575. At the opening of the Holy Door the crowd was enormous, said to number 300,000. The pressure was so great that two hundred persons were forced through the opened entrance before the Pope was able to pass. Pilgrimages arrived from all parts, four hundred confraternities entered the city processionally to the chant of psalms, fourteen thousand came from Spoleto alone, and large numbers from other towns. The confraternity of the Holy Trinity by this time had so strengthened its administration and resources that it was enabled to house and feed, in the course of the year, 365,000 persons, of whom 20,000 were women. To provide spiritual help for this vast multitude confessionals were multiplied in the churches, priests were appointed with all the extraordinary faculties of Penitentiaries, to the number of fifty in St. Peter's, thirty in the Lateran and the same in St. Mary Major's and St. Paul's.

The Pope himself set an example of devotion and penance. He made frequent visits with his attendants to the churches, fasting for three days before each visit. The first was on January 3, when he made his confession, received Holy Communion, went to pray in each of the three basilicas within the city, prostrating himself at the Holy Door and kneeling before the High Altar, the Blessed Sacrament and other altars. He dismounted from his litter at the Ostian Gate, and seventy-four years old as he was, proceeded on foot for a mile and a half to St. Paul's, with no cortege but an immense crowd of devout pilgrims prayerfully following in his steps, he repeating this for three days. In the time of carnival, which was suspended that year, he made the penitential visit of the Seven Churches. In all these exercises he was imitated by many of the Cardinals and by Bishops and prelates of every degree. Among the rest was St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, who edified Rome by the assiduity and compunction with which he every day visited the various sanctuaries. During the year the Pope showed himself frequently to the pilgrims and admitted them freely to kiss his feet, at Easter-tide to the number of three thousand and on one day thirteen thousand.

Clement VIII. celebrated the tenth Jubilee in 1600. Prevented by gout from opening the Holy Door on Christmas Eve, he performed the function on the feast of St. Silvester. Bishops and pilgrims numbering four thousand were entertained at his expense in the Borgo for ten days, the Pope himself serving the tables and his nephews, the Cardinals Aldobrandini and S. Giorgio, washing the feet of all who arrived. He dispensed in charity in the course of the year 300,000 crowns, and on more than one occasion, assisted by Cardinals Borromeo and Baronius, washed the feet of pilgrims at Trinità dei Pellegrini. In this hospice 270,000 persons were lodged during the year, beside 50,000 belonging to aggregated associations. Five hundred and seventy corporate pilgrimages entered Rome in procession during the year, mostly with bare feet, ashes on their heads and penitential garb; 28,000 Masses were said in St. Peter's, 22,000 in St. Paul's, 19,000 in St. Mary Major's, 16,000 in the Church of the Trinità dei Pellegrini, besides the other churches of Rome.

Cardinals Bellarmine, Baronius and others preached often to the people. The Pope visited the Basilicas sixty times in the course of the year, often mounted the Scala Santa on his knees, all the time suffering from gout.

This Jubilee year was marked by the foundation of several charitable institutions. A poor simple man, Fra Alberisio, who went about the streets calling to those he met: "Fate bene, adesso che avete tempo" (Do good, now that you have time), supported with the alms he collected ten thousand pilgrims and originated the brotherhood and hospital still called by his salutation, the "Fate bene Fratelli." Among establishments founded by the Pope himself this year was the Scots' College.

Urban VIII. celebrated the twelfth Jubilee in 1625. The concourse was again great and solemn processions of pilgrims thronged the streets; 210,377 communicants were counted in St. Peter's alone; the number of pilgrims lodged at Trinità dei Pellegrini and its dependency of the Convalescents was over half a million, the figure given in the Register is 588,633. To entertain so great a number the ordinary revenues of the Confraternity were insufficient, and the Pope contributed 10,000 crowns. Cardinals, Princes, Ambassadors and nobles came forward with generous help. The list of the benefactions, sums of 1,000, 800, 500, etc., is still preserved. Still the administrators of the Confraternity were driven to the point of contracting a loan, when Francesco Contarelli, nephew of the Cardinal of the same name, died bequeathing forty-five thousand crowns to the institution. Another Confraternity, the Gonfalone, founded in 1264 by St. Bonaventure, for mutual assistance, joined this year the urgent work of charity and maintained 31,300 pilgrims.

A Protestant historian, Schmeiden, writing from Rome at this time, describes the constant movement, not of passing strangers only, but of the inhabitants of every town and village in Italy. Some places were left almost deserted, the population going in mass to Rome. When they came near the city they ranged themselves in order with their standards, the images of their patron saints and other religious emblems, and so made their entry. They went from church to church in strange garb, some clothed in a white sack with black mantle, some in coarse canvas with cord and hood, some carrying heavy crosses and wearing sackcloth open at the back, scourged themselves as they went.

These penitential exercises were not confined to the poorer pilgrims. Cardinal Lante, venerable in his ninety years, went fifteen times barefooted to visit the Basilicas, and over and over again made the ascent of the Scala Santa on his knees in tears. Five Cardinals divided the city into districts and preached in the squares.

Some amusing incidents are recorded during this Jubilee. The canons of St. Mary Major's wanted to remove the medals which, according to custom, had been built into the Holy Door at its last closing, before the arrival of the Cardinal Legate deputed to reopen it. A reference to authority gave it against the canons. At St. Paul's some one had knocked on the door before the arrival of the Legate; the masons behind the door took this for the ceremonial signal, and at once threw down the wall. A crowd of two hundred persons scrambled through the opening, carrying with them scraps of the plaster as a memento of the day. The old record says that the master of ceremonies "prudently" had the door built up to the height of a man, and when the Legate arrived the rite was proceeded with as usual. As the Pope on Holy Innocents' day was passing through the portico of St. Peter's to make the first of his visits, a pilgrim in his eagerness to kiss the Pope's feet got confused by the crowd and embraced the feet of the Majordomo instead, on which the Pope turned to the unfortunate man and said: "We dispense you from the homage. We take it as done."

Nearly a million and a half of pilgrims visited Rome in 1675, when Clement X. celebrated the fourteenth Jubilee. The register of Trinità dei Pellegrini proves that 300,000 persons were entertained by that institution alone.

The Jubilees of 1700, opened by Innocent XII. and closed by Clement XI., that of 1725 under Benedict XIII. and of 1750 celebrated by Benedict XIV., bring us to the Jubilee of 1775 published by Clement XIV., but celebrated by Pius VI. The concourse at this last was great; at Trinità dei Pellegrini 130,000 were entertained for three days and 395,000 received in Holy Week.

In 1800 no Jubilee could be observed. The French Revolution, sweeping like a tempest over all Europe, did not spare Rome. Pius VI., torn from his See, carried prisoner into France, with the States of the Church a prey to anarchy, was in no condition to open the Holy Year. He died at Valence in August, 1799, and it was not till March of the following year that the Cardinals, assembled in Venice, elected his successor in the person of Pius VII.

We come now to the nineteenth Jubilee, held in 1825 under Leo XII. As this was the last occasion on which the Holy Year was solemnly celebrated, and the ceremonial observed was, so far as the changed conditions of Rome permit, followed by Leo XIII. in the Jubilee recently begun, it may be interesting to dwell at some length on the details of the rite.

On May 24, 1824, the Pope held a Consistory to consult the Cardinals on the means for best promoting the success of the undertaking. On the same day he issued a Bull of general invitation to Rome in the following year. On Ascension day, attended by a numerous court, in the Sala Regia, he consigned the Jubilee Bull to a prelate official of the Apostolic Datary for publication. The prelate immediately proceeded to the porch of St. Peter's, and from an elevated stage read the proclamation to the sound of trumpet and drum, followed by a discharge of musketry. At the same time three couriers, with attendant drums and trumpets, were dispatched to publish the Bull at the doors of the other three churches.

The Pope next ordered missions to be preached during the first half of August in six of the principal squares of the city, piazze Navona, Barberini, Colonna, Monti, S. Giacomo and S. Maria Maggiore. Orators of the highest repute were selected, and the Pope himself assisted at the close of the mission in piazza Navona and blessed the people from a balcony. On the last Sunday of Advent the Bull was again read, and on Christmas Eve the Porta Santa was opened.

For three days before the vigil all the bells of the churches were rung for two hours. Long before the hour for Vespers the vast square of St. Peter's began to fill. From all the approaches from the Borgo, from Trastevere and from the neighboring gates of the city crowds of Romans and strangers and peasants in the picturesque costumes of their various villages hastened to secure the most advantageous places. Soldiers, horse and foot, were drawn up behind the people; the colonnade was hung with the brilliant tapestries from Raphael's designs, the piazza had a festive air, but the great gates of the basilica were closed, the church was empty.

Before leaving his apartments the Pope announced the names of the three Legates deputed to open the Holy Doors in the other basilicas at the same time that he opened the one in St. Peter's. They were, as is the custom, the Cardinal Dean for St. Paul's and the Cardinals Archpriests of the other two churches for each respectively. Robed pontifically in crimson vestments and wearing a mitre, he proceeded to the Sixtine Chapel to pray before the Holy Sacrament solemnly exposed. The Apostolic sub-deacon led the way, bearing aloft the pontifical three-barred cross. Seven acolytes, prelates of the Tribunal of the Signatura, carrying candles, surrounded the Papal cross. While the Pope knelt in adoration lighted candles were distributed to the assistants. After incensing the Blessed Sacrament the Pope intoned the hymn "Veni Creator," which was taken up by the choir. Then, seated on the *Sedia Gestatoria,* the portable chair of state, he was borne on the shoulders of twelve attendants in bright livery, under a splendid canopy of gold cloth, with the *flabelli,* or fans of ostrich feathers carried by chamberlains on either side, holding in his left hand a candle presented to him by the first Cardinal Deacon, and blessing with his right as he went. Preceded by the dignitaries of the Papal Chapel, the Bishops assistant at the throne and the three orders of Cardinals, vested according to their rank in rich dalmatics, chasubles or copes and followed by all the colleges of prelates, he was conducted down the Scala Regia to the colonnade and through the square between a double line of the clergy of Rome marshaled to let him pass to the portico of St. Peter's.

In the portico, in front of the Holy Door, which is the last on the right hand, a throne was prepared. On this the Pope seated himself for a few moments, then he rose, and taking a silver hammer from the hands of the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary, advanced to the Door and struck upon it with the hammer, saying: "Open ye to me the Gates of Justice," to which the choir answered: "I will go into them, and give praise to the Lord." Striking the door a second time, he said: "I will come into Thy House," and the choir answered: "I will worship towards Thy Holy Temple." A third time he struck the door, with the words: "Open the Gates, for the Lord is with us," and the response of the choir: "Who hath shown His power in Israel." The Pope then returned to the throne, and the Grand Penitentiary struck the door twice with the hammer. Upon this the door, which had previously been detached from the wall on all sides, was made to fall gently back, and, inclined on a massive frame of wood, was drawn aside. The Penitentiaries washed carefully the doorstep and lintels with sponges and dried them with fine linen cloths. When this was done the Pope rose and recited the prayer, *Actiones nostras,* and the choir sang the 99th Psalm, "Jubilate Deo omnis terra." This was followed by some versicles and the prayer recited by the Pope: "O God, who by Thy servant Moses didst institute a year of Jubilee for Thy people of Israel, grant to us Thy servants a happy commencement to this Jubilee instituted by Thy authority, in which Thou willest this door to be opened for Thy people to offer prayers to Thy Majesty, so that, having obtained in it pardon and full remission of all our offenses, when the day of our summons arrives, we may be found worthy to share Thy glory by the gift of Thy mercy."

Having finished the prayer, the Pope resumed his mitre, and descending from the throne, advanced towards the Holy Door. Standing on the step, he took in his right hand the triple cross from the sub-deacon and holding his lighted candle in his left, he intoned the "Te Deum," and then crossed the threshold, the first to enter the Basilica. The assistant Cardinals, two and two, followed, with all the rest, and the crowd immediately after. The Pope again was raised on the Sedia Gestatoria and carried to the Altar of the Confession, or High Altar under the dome, where he assisted at Vespers.

As the Pope crossed the threshold of the Holy Door the great bell of St. Peter's rang out its loud-voiced peal; at the signal the bells of more than three hundred churches joined their music, and the cannon of the castle of S. Angelo thundered the tidings to the foot of the Alban Hills and the shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

Such was the ceremonial at the opening of the last Jubilee. When shorn of all the pomp of the gorgeous public procession and approach to the basilica through the colonnade and great square of St. Peter's—when the Holy Father is constrained to make his entrance into his own church by a private door from his palace—and the majesty of the solemn rite is confined to a narrow space guarded to protect it from insult, in the presence of a few privileged witnesses, the opening of the Holy Door for the Jubilee of 1900 must have filled the hearts of all who assisted with conflicting emotions. But regret at the absence of much that gave dignity and solemnity to the occasion, impossible to-day under a hostile domination, was overpowered in the gladness of the thought that in any form it had been granted to Leo XIII., after seventy-five years since he himself assisted at the last opening of the Porta Santa, to open to us with such grandeur of solemnity as still exists the treasures of God's grace and pardon.

JAMES A. CAMPBELL.

Rome.

THE ELECTION OF ALEXANDER VI.

ON the 6th day of August, A. D. 1492—three days had passed since the little fleet of Christopher Columbus had departed from Palos on its memorable voyage of discovery—three-and-twenty Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church met in conclave at the Vatican for the purpose of selecting a successor to Pope Innocent VIII. As the reader may be curious to form some personal acquaintance with the eminent dignitaries who were responsible to the Church and to humanity for the election of Alexander VI., I shall assume the office of *cicerone* and introduce them one by one as they enter the sacred enclosure.

In fact, the Cardinals of the fifteenth century are far better known to fame than their successors at any later age; and this for two reasons. First, they were then much fewer in numbers. Ever since the days of Avignon they had made persistent efforts to restrict the membership of the Sacred College to little above a score, thus increasing their individual importance to the detriment of the Papal monarchy. Indeed it was no fault of theirs if the form of Church government was not converted into a downright Venetian aristocracy, with the Supreme Pontiff reduced to the position of a mere Doge or figurehead. Secondly, and as a consequence of their overshadowing influence, it was taken for granted that to them and to their father's houses belonged "all the best things of Israel." It fairly takes one's breath away to read the long catalogue of incongruous and incompatible benefices which many of them held, or, to speak more accurately, the revenues of which they appropriated to their own use. As a natural result, they were, away and beyond, the most opulent, and therefore the most powerful, princes of their time; and their friendship was obsequiously courted by Popes and kings. As another result, and one which "did not nor could not come to good," the Cardinalate became the coveted prey of princely and royal cadets and of intriguing and unscrupulous politicians.

It would be childish to expect that any Pope of reforming tendencies could do much in the way of abolishing these abuses. In the first place, no Papal candidate known to be a reformer could by any possibility run the gauntlet of a Conclave. Moreover, the right of presentation to benefices was only to a limited extent vested in the Pope. The major portion of the emoluments of the Cardinals came through the *jus patronatus* of monarchs and princes, who thus secured their good-will and services, often to the grave displeasure and inconvenience of the Supreme Pontiff.

The objects to which the Cardinals devoted their enormous incomes were as different as their respective characters. But taking them for all in all, and thanking God that the Renaissance Cardinals have forever disappeared from the earth, we are compelled by justice to admit that to their generous patronage of the arts more than to any other factor, we owe the first awakenings of modern culture. Their faults and vices may be imputed to the circumstances of their times; but the high and noble impulses which distinguish them from the secular barons of that or any other age, they owed to the promptings of the Catholic faith, which was operative in the most worldly of them.

To return to the Conclave of 1492: The first in order of seniority, this prince of Holy Church who advances with tall, majestic figure, noble countenance and piercing black eyes, is Cardinal *Rodrigo Borgia,* Dean of the Sacred College. The blood of the royal race of Aragon flows in his veins. He is now sixty years of age; during thirty-seven of which he has worn the Roman purple. It was by mere accident that he ever became identified either with Rome or with the priesthood. Born in the province of Valencia, he had chosen the army for his calling, when the elevation of his uncle, Calixtus III., to the Papacy opened up new prospects to his ambition. He immediately came, or was summoned, to Rome; and since his younger brother was selected for the office of Captain General of the Pontifical forces, there was nothing left for Rodrigo but to become a Cardinal. "Could Calixtus have foreseen the evil which his nephews would do to Italy and to the Church," exclaims Pastor indignantly, "he would certainly, instead of elevating them, have banished them to the deepest dungeons of Spain."[1] No doubt he would; but since he laid no claim to the gift of prophecy, there is very little use or consolation in our losing our tempers at this late day because of his mistake. Under four successive Pontiffs Rodrigo has held separate court as "a second Pope," for during this extended period he has been Vice Chancellor of the Roman Church.[2] Strange rumors are in circulation regarding the private life of the great Cardinal; but these malicious whispers are scarcely audible amidst the chorus of applause which greets him as the most magnanimous, most affable, most industrious and most efficient official who, within the memory of living men, has transacted the business of the Holy See.

---

[1] Pastor, II., 448.

Next in the order of seniority comes *Francesco Piccolomini*, popularly known as the Cardinal of Siena. As Borgia owed his early elevation to the partiality of his uncle, Calixtus III., so did Piccolomini owe his still more youthful elevation to the affection of his mother's brother, Pope Pius II. But here ends the resemblance between them; for whereas the young Borgia had been made an ecclesiastic, or at least a Cardinal, almost in spite of himself and without any preliminary spiritual training, Piccolomini, after a boyhood passed in destitute circumstances, had been taken into the household of his uncle and most carefully prepared for the priesthood under his able and experienced direction. "In his twenty-third year, immediately upon his receiving his doctor's hat as canonist, he was appointed Archbishop of Siena in January, 1460; in the following March he was created Cardinal; in April, after the death of the Cardinal of Pavia (Ammannati), he was sent as Legate to the Picentine March, with the experienced Bishop of Marsico as his counsellor. The only thing objectionable about him was his youth; for in the administration of his Legation and in his later conduct at the Curia he proved to be a man of spotless character and many-sided capacity, not to be compared with the scandalous nephew whom Calixtus had introduced into the Sacred College."[3]

"In the time of Paul II., he filled the difficult post of Legate in Germany with consummate tact, to the great satisfaction of the then Pope; the knowledge of German which he had acquired while living in the household of Pius II. being naturally of great assistance to him there. Afterwards, when, owing to the influence of the nephews of Sixtus IV., a worldly spirit predominated at the Court, he, like others of a pious and serious turn of mind, kept away from Rome as much as possible, and still more so in the time of Alexander VI. Like his uncle, Cardinal Piccolomini was tormented with gout, and was prematurely old and decrepid, although he had led a very regular life. Sigismondo de' Conti[4] especially praises his scrupulous love of order. 'He left no moment unoccupied; his time for study was before daybreak; he spent his mornings in prayer and his midday hours in giving audiences, to which the humblest had easy access. He was so temperate in food and drink that he only allowed himself an evening meal every other day.' "[5]

---

[2] Two contrary reasons have been assigned for the anomaly that a Cardinal holding the position of Chancellor to the Pope should be designated a *Vice*-Chancellor. The common explanation is that the chancellorship being merely of prelatial rank, it would be beneath the dignity of a Cardinal to hold it otherwise than as a *locum tenens*. On the other hand, the Benedictine compilers of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, speaking of Boniface VIII., inform us that "la dignité de Chancelier de l'Eglise Romaine fut supprimée sous son Pontificat, *quia*, dit le Docteur Taberelli, *Cancellarius de pari certabat cum Papa.*'"

[3] Voigt, Enea Silvio, vol. iii., p. 531.

Borgia and Piccolomini are the sole survivors in 1492 of the remote times of Calixtus III. and Pius II. Of the Cardinals created by Paul II., three still remain. Two of them, *Battista Zeno* and *Giovanni Michiel,* owed their elevation to their close relationship to that Pontiff, being his sisters' children. Like the true Venetian noblemen they are, they may confidently be relied upon to lose no opportunity of advancing their own interests. This will undoubtedly be the case with Michiel.

Their colleague, *Oliviero Carafa,* is a man of widely different stamp. He was created Cardinal by Paul II. on September 18, 1467. He was a distinguished member, indeed one of the chief founders, of the great Neapolitan house which has furnished to that most charming of modern Catholic historians, Alfred von Reumont, the subject of one of his most delightful monographs, *Die Carafa von Maddaloni.* The prominent part which Cardinal Carafa took in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time seems to justify us in making a somewhat extended extract from Reumont's description of him. "He was born in 1430. . . . At the age of eight-and-twenty Oliviero was raised by Pius II. to the archiepiscopal dignity. Nine years afterwards Paul II. invested him with the Roman purple. He was a jurist, a theologian, an antiquarian, a statesman. He even exerted himself in the art of war, as an admiral, in commanding a fleet of galleys against the Turks, but without any fortunate results. Like most of his race, faithful and attached to the Aragonese, in whose favors he shared largely, and often in the midst of the difficulties attending the varying politics of the Popes Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI., he defended the interests of his sovereign's family. According to the morality or immorality of those times, he accumulated, besides his archbishopric of Naples, that he could only visit occasionally, a number of bishoprics and abbeys—Chieti, that he resigned to his cousin, afterwards Pope; Rimini, Terracina, and so on; and the famous Abbeys of La Cave and Monte Vergine, which are visited in these days, not merely on account of their picturesque situation in the mountains, but also for the sake of the rich treasures contained in their archives. . . . Few Cardinals have been so popular in Rome. He deserved this popularity by the use which he made of his great income, as well as by the courteousness of his character. He was a very liberal supporter of science and learning; many youths have been won over by him to the Church and to serious studies. He built for the Lateran prebendaries the monastery next to Santa Maria della Pace, that church which was built by Pope Sixtus IV. to commemorate the peace which he obtained, not by, but after, the long wars carried on during his government, where Raphael's Sybils and Bramante's Court are to be admired. He left his beautiful collection of books to this institution."[6]

---

[4] "Sigismondo de' Conti was a man of good family in Foligno, where he held the office of Chancellor under Paul II. He was famous as a Humanist, and came in 1476 to improve his fortunes in Rome, where he was made one of the secretaries of the Curia. He attended Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere in an embassy to Germany in 1480, and in 1482 was made one of the secretaries of the Pope. This office he held till 1502, when he retired; but Julius II. appointed him his private secretary, and he died in Rome in 1512. He is famous in the history of art as the donor whose portrait was painted by Raffaelle in the great picture of the 'Madonna di Foligno' which was painted by his order." Creighton, vol. iv., p. 328.

[5] Pastor, vol. vi., p. 199. The Catholic historian repels with righteous indignation the infamous lie invented by Gregorovius in his *Lucrezia Borgia*, and repeated, parrot-like, by Brosch and Bishop Creighton. that Piccolomini—later Pope Pius III.—was "the happy father of no fewer than twelve children, boys and girls." This is by no means the only instance in which Gregorovius' fertile imagination has travestied the facts of history. We trust that the learned Bishop of London will be careful to remove this unseemly blemish from his admirable book in a future edition.

Although Cardinal Carafa passed the most of his time in Rome in the service of the Holy See, yet he did not entirely neglect his diocese. He built the high altar in the Cathedral of Naples, and also the magnificent shrine of St. Januarius, before which, at the present day, the traveler still admires the marble statue of the Cardinal, which Reumont pronounces as "amongst the best sculptures of Naples," represented kneeling in prayer. As additional claims upon our esteem, we may mention that Cardinal Carafa was one of the earliest and most generous patrons of the newly-discovered art of printing; and that he was chiefly influential in forming the priestly character of his young cousin, John Peter Carafa, who, in the next generation, ascended the Chair of St. Peter, to begin, as Pope Paul IV., the long series of Reforming Popes.

The next twelve Cardinals who enter the Conclave of 1492 are the survivors of the successive creations of Pope Sixtus IV.[7] The first of these, in seniority as in personal worth, is our old friend *Giuliano della Rovere.*

"Tutti lo miran, tutti onor gli fanno."

In his own and the general estimation he enters all but elected; only to come out in a few days a bitterly disappointed man. He is attended by two cousins, *Basso della Rovere* and *Domenico della Rovere;* also by a fourth creature of the Sixtine family, the young *Raffaello Riario*, whose bloodless cheeks give evidence that he has not yet recovered from the effects of the shock imparted to his nervous system by the awful tragedy of April 26, 1478, in which he was the innocent and unconscious tool of his uncle, Girolamo.

---

[6] Reumont: The Carafas of Maddaloni, Bohn edition, p. 139.

[7] Pastor says (vol iv., p. 416) that the Cardinals of Sixtus present at this Conclave numbered *fourteen*. But this is evidently a mistake.

Another of the Cardinals of Sixtus is *George da Costa*, a Portuguese of obscure parentage, who by his talents and industry worked his way upwards to the dignity of Archbishop of Lisbon and the office of Prime Minister of his sovereign, Alfonso V. But since his admission into the College of Cardinals, in 1476, Costa has seen little or nothing of his native land, and he has the reputation of being one of the wealthiest prelates of his age. As he is a man of considerable ability, and has prudently kept himself aloof from the intricacies of Italian politics, there are many who are of opinion that his chances of election are good.

The eleventh Cardinal on our list is *Paolo Fregoso*, known as the Cardinal of Genoa. He may be described as an odd combination of priest, condottiere and party leader. Belonging to the aristocratic family of the Campofregosi, he was made Archbishop of Genoa as early as 1453,[8] and thereafter took an active part in all the tumults and revolutions which seemed to be the delight of his native city. At times he combined the offices of Bishop and Doge; soon to spend a more or less extended period in exile. Such had been the vicissitudes of his stormy career, when, in 1480, Pope Sixtus IV., recognizing in his fellow Ligurian a kindred spirit, and desirous of employing his talents and experience in the defense of Christendom against the Turks, created him Cardinal and appointed him Admiral of the Papal fleet destined to aid in driving the invaders from Otranto. It became apparent, however, that the leader of a municipal faction was not necessarily a great commander. Fregoso's admiralship brought him no laurels; and we hear little of him from the time he returned to Rome in disfavor with the Pope, until he reappears at the present Conclave.

With two exceptions, the remaining Cardinals of Sixtus IV. are representatives of the Roman nobility. *John Baptist Savelli*, a man of considerable ability, had been designated for the honors of the purple as far back as 1471, the last year of Paul II. But since that Pontiff had already exceeded the number to which the jealousy of the Cardinals wished to restrict the membership of the Sacred College, he was forced to keep Savelli and two other candidates *in petto*. Paul died suddenly soon afterwards; whereupon the Cardinals, notwithstanding they had promised, in the event of his death, to admit his nominees, now refused to acknowledge their claims. Their opposition was mainly owing to the unwillingness of the powerful Cardinal Latino Orsini to give admission to the scion of a hostile family; for the Savelli were hereditary allies of the Colonna, and consequently in feud with the Orsini. It was not until the year 1480, when Latino had died, that Savelli finally took his seat in the College of Cardinals.

---

[8] Gams, Series Episcoporum, p. 715.

He took his seat together with his friend *Giovanni Colonna*, son of Prince Antonio of Salerno, and brother of Prospero, Duke of Paliano. He was also grand-nephew of Pope Martin V., the restorer of the Papacy after the Great Schism. In the simultaneous elevation of these two Roman princes, we seem to discover the influence of Cardinal Giuliano, who no doubt was confident he could count upon their gratitude.

Either for the purpose of holding the balance fairly between the two chief factions of the Roman barons, or yielding to the wishes of Girolamo Riario, Sixtus, in 1483, raised to the Cardinalate *Battista Orsini* and *Giovanni Conti;* and thus "the seeds of party strife were introduced into the Sacred College."[9]

History fails to inform us what unusual gifts Sixtus discerned in *Giacomo Sclafenati*, or by what extraordinary influences he was induced to bestow the dignity of the purple on this Bishop of Parma at the early age of twenty-three.

The total absence of any ecclesiastical recommendation, and the pressure of irresistible political influence, are painfully evident in the last Cardinal created by Sixtus, *Ascanio Maria Sforza.* Of him we may, with full truth, affirm, that which Guicciardini, with more wit than accuracy, says of Giuliano: "There is nothing priestly about him, except his cassock." Even the cassock he wears as seldom as possible; for he feels more at home, and is oftenest seen, in the habit and with the environment of a secular prince. He has been forced to adopt the ecclesiastical calling, for the simple reason that he is a cadet of the House of Milan. His brother, Lodovico il Moro, the Regent of Milan, having set his heart upon ousting the rightful Duke, their nephew John Galeazzo, has at length succeeded, in the face of strenuous opposition, in obtaining a seat in the Sacred College for Ascanio, as a first step toward the realization of his nefarious design. It will not be Lodovico's fault if Ascanio does not ascend still higher.

We have thus accounted for seventeen of the twenty-three voters. Next follow the Cardinals created by Pope Innocent VIII. The first of these is *Lorenzo Cibò*, whose elevation, in 1489, aroused a great deal of adverse comment, since he was a natural son of the Pontiff's brother, Maurice. The stain of birth is, however, the only blemish which history has recorded against him; nor, on the other hand, has much been said in his favor; for, like all the Cibòs, he is of no great intellectual calibre, and his principal title to the respect of posterity is that he will reject with scorn the seductions of Borgia.

---

[9] Pastor, vol. v., p. 415

Another of Innocent's Cardinals is *Ardicino della Porta,* who is described as "a fit and worthy man."[10] His subsequent conduct will prove that the eulogy is not unmerited; for he will atone, in the penitential garb of St. Romoald, for the fatal error of placing his vote and conscience in the unscrupulous hands of Ascanio.[11]

The next Cardinal on the list is *Antonio Pallavicini,* a fellow-countryman of the Genoese Pontiff. Little is known concerning him; but that little is creditable. Regarding *Giovanni de' Medici,* the future Leo X., it is needless to discourse at length. He is now seventeen years of age, and life lies before him. He has been lucky in securing his anomalous position before the departure of Lorenzo and Innocent; for otherwise his promotion would in all probability have been indefinitely postponed. How much, by the way, would the Church have lost by that contingency?

There still remain two Cardinals whose right to participate in the Conclave is the subject of serious discussion, for they have not yet been formally installed. The first of these is *Federigo Sanseverino,* son of the famous Robert, General of the Venetian armies. As his two brothers are in the service of the Duke of Milan, his cause is warmly advocated by Ascanio, by whose influence he is admitted to the College. Consequently, when the aged Patriarch of Venice, the nonagenarian *Maffeo Gherardo,* arrived, with an energetic demand from the Signory that his rights should not be assailed, his claims were acknowledged, mainly through the exertions of Giuliano della Rovere, who thought thus to secure his vote; but, as the result will show, that able politician has made a serious miscalculation.

The reader is now in possession of sufficient data to form an intelligent judgment upon the character of the men who composed the Conclave of 1492. Though they were not ideal princes of the Church, yet they were far superior to the reputation which "history," relying on worthless gossip and exaggerated rhetoric, has hitherto commonly accorded them. They numbered in their ranks experienced statesmen, whose equals could not have been found in any court of Europe. They numbered, moreover, men of deep conscientiousness and unfeigned piety. But what caused this Conclave to come to so disastrous a termination was the fact that the Cardinals of most commanding genius and influence were precisely the few who possessed the least either of piety or of conscience.

---

[10] Pastor, vol. v., p. 356. [11] Raynald, ad annum 1492, n. 3. has preserved an extremely interesting letter written by Porta to Alexander VI., in which he defends his action in renouncing the purple and assuming the lowly habit of the Camaldolese. Alexander had given his sanction to the step; but the Cardinals maintained that the consent of the Sacred College was also needed.

The proceedings of the Conclave were opened with the exact observance of all those religious rites whereby Holy Church seeks to impress the electors with a keen sense of their awful responsibility. The address of Leonello Chieregato, Bishop of Concordia in the Venetian territory, large extracts from which are given by Raynaldus, was a masterly exposition of the needs and dangers of the times, and a fearless appeal to the conscience of the Cardinals. His peroration would do credit to Savonarola; indeed, viewed in the wierd light of subsequent events, it might seem that the preacher was inspired. The reader will thank us for inserting it:

"Sorely is the Church afflicted. But it is in your power, most excellent fathers, to comfort and console her. Banishing from your hearts every suggestion of egotism, ambition and party spirit, harbor no other thought than that of coöperating with the Divine Will in the selection of a Pontiff eminent for sanctity, learning and experience. The eyes of the whole Church are fixed upon you. Give her a Pontiff who, by the very odor of his good name, shall draw all the faithful after him unto salvation. For it is written in the books of wise men that the entire commonwealth, as it is infected and ruined by the lusts and vices of its princes, so, too, is it by their self-restraint and virtues corrected and preserved. Whatever deterioration takes place in the morals of princes is followed by a similar change in the habits of the people; and the adage is proved true: That the bad example of rulers is more harmful than their personal offenses. Choose, then, for ruler *the best*. Him you will easily recognize if you hearken to Plato, who enjoins that he only ought to be chosen who in every period of life has been without reproach, and whose persevering endeavor it has been to promote the public welfare; for otherwise, he teaches, the Deity will doom the community to destruction. To the same effect does the Blessed Pope Leo command that you should elect one whose whole life from earliest childhood until his ripest years has been devoted to the faithful service of the Church; one whose past career leaves us without apprehension as to his future; and whose elevation to a higher station must be regarded as the reward justly due to his many labors, his unsullied morals and his strenuous industry. Shudder at the thought, most reverend fathers, that the Lord should ever say of you: 'They have made for themselves a king, but not through me; a prince, but with no counsel of mine.' Now the counsel of the Lord is, if we believe Jerome, that the man most distinguished for learning and sanctity and most conspicuous by the possession of every good quality should ascend to the supreme Pontificate by pure and upright means, without resorting to intrigues or bribery. Recall the fate of Abimelech. He did indeed reach the goal of his ambition, and ruled over the people of Israel. But brief and turbulent was his reign, and he came to an ignoble end.

"To sum up my remarks in one short sentence: Imprint upon your hearts and carry into effect the sacred canons which regulate the election of the Roman Pontiff and other Prelates. Do this; and under the coming Pontiff, the Church will without doubt once more resume her flourishing estate: Through the mercy of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is blessed forever and ever."

If the eminent dignitaries to whom this stirring appeal was addressed had obeyed the injunctions of the eloquent orator, it is quite probable that another Chieregato, the preacher's cousin, would have been spared the indignities which were in reserve for him at the Diet of Nurnberg. But, of all men then living, the worldly-minded Cardinals who composed this Conclave were the least able to foresee and the least disposed to reck the ultimate consequences of the step they were about to take. They will, however, have occasion to "recall the fate of Abimelech"—one of them when he bends, heart-broken, over the mangled corpse of his favorite son; others when, during the turbulent years that are to come, they languish in prison or wander about in exile.

From the moment that a Conclave is closed until the door is thrown open to announce the election of the new Pontiff, all the proceedings are supposed to be, and eternally to remain, a profound secret from those who are without. Viewing the Conclave of 1492 from the standpoint of those who were thus excluded, we must say that seldom has it happened in the history of the Papacy that an election has been conducted with a more scrupulous attention to order, freedom and dignity. During the four days that the Cardinals remained in seclusion, the most inquisitive and keen-scented envoys of the European powers had absolutely no news to impart to their respective Courts. They were all equally surprised, though not similarly affected, when the wicket was thrown open on the morning of August 11th, and announcement was made that the Vice-Chancellor, Rodrigo Borgia, had been duly elected, and had chosen the name of ALEXANDER VI.

But divine Clio is too shrewd and fearless a Maid, either to accept appearances for facts, or to permit official pronouncements to interfere with her inalienable right of ascertaining the truth. To do justice to her discernment, she no sooner heard the sad news than she began to form that judgment upon it to which the veteran pen of Ranke has given definitive form:

"Amidst the universal corruption, it was a universal calamity, and discreditable to the whole human race, that, in the retired cells of the Conclave assembled to elect a Pope, amid high and holy ceremonies, and among men who had no further wants, and no one to provide for, it was not the weal of Christendom, so sorely in need, that determined the election, nor that of a nation—no, nor even genuine affections and emotions. The highest dignity in the Church was regarded as the inheritance of all Cardinals; given, because, alas! it was indivisible, to the one who promised the others most."[12]

That Borgia secured his election through "the rankest simony,"[13] is a fact too well authenticated to admit of a doubt. The Cardinals who had rejected his bribes proclaimed it immediately; and those who had accepted them confessed it later on. It is all but officially stated in the scathing terms with which the Bull of Pope Julius II., dated 14 January, 1505, anathematizes and invalidates a Papal election obtained by simoniacal means. Besides, what interest is served by denying it? It lessens, not increases, the scandal, when we reflect that the "thief and robber" entered not by the door, as the legitimate outcome of those "high and holy ceremonies" alluded to by Ranke, but climbed in *aliunde*.

Sifting the mass of evidence which has been collected by the diligence of Pastor and other investigators, we seem to be able to assure the reader that the following narrative of the proceedings is substantially correct:

The principal candidates at the beginning of the Conclave were Giuliano della Rovere and Ascanio Sforza. The claims of the former were supported by France and Genoa, which were commonly reported (though this may be only idle rumor) to have put 300,000 ducats at his disposal; strange to say, his old-time foe, now become his firm adherent, Ferrante of Naples, also worked hard to secure his election. "Naples and France," remarks Pastor, "though preparing for a final and decisive hostile encounter, supported meanwhile the same candidate for the Papal Chair."[14]

Giuliano's strength was at the same time his weakness. The favor of France was a poor recommendation in the eyes of the Italians. On the other hand, not every one was as able or as willing to forget old grievances as the veteran politician who occupied the throne of Naples. The consequence was that all those who disliked or mistrusted the Rovere gathered about Ascanio, whose candidature was urged with vigor and address by his brother, il Moro. An abortive attempt to compound their differences was made by the two antagonists in a prolonged interview held in the sacristy of St. Peter's on August 4th. As no eavesdropper was permitted to hear their conversation, we can only surmise, from the event, that neither was disposed to withdraw or compromise.

---

[12] Ranke's "Latin and Teutonic Nations," p. 41. [13] Pastor, V., p. 385. [14] Pastor, V., p. 379.

Having tested each other's strength, they were far too shrewd to permit their names to be brought forward in the earlier Scrutinies of the Conclave, during which the names of Carafa and Costa were prominently canvassed. Three days passed in fruitless balloting, with no prospect of opening the deadlock. We are sufficiently acquainted with Giuliano to be certain that he would have fought it out till doom's day before yielding an inch; it is proverbial with his ancestral "oak" to break, but not to bend. His rival, though equally firm and unscrupulous, took a more "common-sense" view of the situation; he improved upon the lesson taught him eight years before by Giuliano, and aspired, in his turn, to be "the power behind the throne." Ascanio will ere long discover that Borgia is not a Cibò. Our readers will thank us for permitting Dr. Pastor to give the story in his own words:

"A sudden change came over the whole situation. As soon as Ascanio Sforza perceived that there was no likelihood that he would himself be chosen, he began to lend a willing ear to Borgia's brilliant offers. Rodrigo not only promised him the office of Vice-Chancellor"—worth 8,000 ducats a year—"with his own Palace"—which, to the present day, perpetuates the memory of this shameful bargain by bearing the name of *Palazzo Sforza-Cesarini*—"but in addition to this the Castle of Nepi, the Bishopric of Erlau, with a revenue of 10,000 ducats, and other benefices. Cardinal Orsini was to receive the two fortified towns of Monticelli and Soriano, the legation of the Marches and the Bishopric of Carthagena; Cardinal Colonna, the Abbacy of Subiaco, with all the surrounding villages; Savelli, Civita Castellana and the Bishopric of Majorca; Pallavicini, the Bishopric of Pampeluna; Giovanni Michiel the suburban Bishopric of Porto; the Cardinals Sclafenati, Sanseverino, Riario and Domenico della Rovere, rich abbacies and valuable benefices. By these simoniacal means, counting his own vote and those of the Cardinals Ardicino della Porta and Conti, who belonged to the Sforza party, Borgia had thus secured fourteen votes,[15] and only one more was wanting to complete the majority of two-thirds.[16] This one, however, was not easy to obtain. The Cardinals Carafa, Costa, Piccolomini and Zeno were not to be won by any promises, however brilliant; and the young Giovanni de' Medici held with them. Cardinal Basso followed Giuliano della Rovere, who would not hear of Borgia's election. Lorenzo Cibo also held aloof from these unhallowed transactions. Thus Gherardo, now in his ninety-sixth year and hardly in possession of his faculties, alone remained, and he was persuaded by those who were about him to give his vote to Borgia."

---

[15] Not twenty-four, as the English translation makes him say. Father Antrobus' printer is vexatiously inexact in his figures. [16] Pastor is at fault in his count. It takes *sixteen* to make a two-thirds vote, when there are twenty-three electors. The Innsbruck historian has overlooked Fregoso, whose vote, no doubt, was cheaply secured.

This vote of the venerable Patriarch of Venice is the very climax of the whole tragedy. It was the crowning triumph of the power of darkness, that the voice which elected the unworthy Borgia to the saintliest dignity of Christendom was the voice of a saint! Not all Rodrigo's riches, nor all Ascanio's power, could have held that ignoble phalanx together for a day. The only hope of success which the two main conspirators could entertain lay in the celerity with which they could rush the election through, before their dupes had time to listen to the admonitions of conscience, and their opponents to expose the infamy of their intrigues.

It is commonly stated by historians, on the authority of Infessura, that Gherardo's vote was obtained by bribery; and Gregorovius indulges his poetic fancy by representing the aged Patriarch as "stretching forth his palsied hand to clutch five thousand ducats." But his saintly life, as a Camaldolese monk, and later as Prelate, forbid our giving credence to any such enormity. It was surely no difficult task to circumvent a decrepid old man, who was thinking more of his speedy dissolution than of earthly matters,[17] in which he could feel but a remote concern. His unacquaintance with Rome and the Curia, and the irksomeness of confinement to one who was at death's door, are quite sufficient to explain his vote.

And now, having placed this painful episode before the reader, as we have found it in the best authorities, "nothing extenuating nor setting down aught in malice," we give him time to regain his breath before we continue our narrative.

J. F. LOUGHLIN.

Philadelphia.

THE MODERN MUSICAL MASS.*

TO one who is accustomed to study the history of art in the light of the law of evolution the contrast between the reigning modern style of Catholic church music and that of the Middle Age seems at first sight very difficult of explanation. The growth of the *a capella* chorus, which reached its perfection in the sixteenth century, may be traced through a steady process of development, every step of which was a logical consequence of some prior invention. But as we pass onward into the age succeeding and look for a form of Catholic music which may be taken as the natural offspring and successor of the venerable mediæval style, we find what appears to be a break in the line of continuity. The ancient form maintains its existence throughout the seventeenth century and a portion of the eighteenth, but it is slowly crowded to one side and at last driven from the field altogether by a style which, if we search in the field of church art alone, appears to have no antecedent. The new style is opposed to the old in every particular. Instead of forms that are polyphonic in structure, vague and indefinite in plan, based on an antique key system, the new compositions are homophonic in structure, definite and sectional in plan, revealing an entirely novel principle of tonality, containing vocal solos as well as choruses and supported by a free instrumental accompaniment. These two contrasted phases of religious music seem to have nothing in common so far as technical organization is concerned, and it is perfectly evident that the younger style could not have been evolved out of the elder. Hardly less divergent are they in respect to ideal of expression, the ancient style never departing from a moderate, unimpassioned uniformity, the modern abounding in variety and contrast, and continually striving after a sort of dramatic portrayal of subjective moods. To a representative of the old school this florid accompanied style would seem like an intruder from quite an alien sphere of experience, and the wonder grows when we discover that it sprang from the same national soil as that in which its predecessor ripened, and was likewise cherished by an institution that has made immutability in all essentials a cardinal principle. Whence came the impulse that effected so sweeping a change in a great historic form of art, where we might expect that liturgic necessities and ecclesiastical tradition would decree a tenacious conservatism? What new conception had seized upon the human mind so powerful that it could even revolutionize a large share of the musical system of the Catholic Church? Had there been a long preparation for a change that seems so sudden? Were there causes working under the surface, antecedent stages, such that the violation of the law of continuity is apparent only and not real? These questions are easily answered if we abandon the useless attempt to find the parentage of the modern church style in the ritual music of the previous period, and by surveying all the musical conditions of the age we shall quickly discover that it was an intrusion into the Church of musical methods that were fostered under purely secular auspices. The Gregorian chant and the mediæval *a capella* chorus were born and nurtured within the fold of the Church, growing directly out of the necessity of adapting musical cadences to the rhythmical phrases of the liturgy. The modern sectional and florid style, on the contrary, was an addition from without and was not introduced in response to any liturgical demands whatever. In origin and affiliations it was a secular style, adopted by the Church under a necessity which she eventually strove to turn into a virtue.

---

[17] Gherardo died, according to Gams, on the 14th of the following month. Would that he had passed to his eternal repose a few weeks earlier! His praises, celebrated by Pietro Delphino, General of the Camaldolese Order, may be read in Raynald, ad annum, 1492, n. 32.

*The present article is the continuation of two earlier essays in THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, viz., "Music in the Early Christian Church," January, 1898, and "The Mediæval Chorus Music of the Catholic Church," April, 1899.

This violent reversal of the traditions of Catholic music was simply a detail of that universal revolution in musical practice and ideal which marked the passage from the sixteenth century to the seventeenth. The learned music of Europe had been for centuries almost exclusively in the care of ecclesiastical and princely chapels, and its practitioners held offices that were primarily clerical. The professional musicians, absorbed in churchly functions, had gone on adding Masses to Masses, Motets to Motets and Hymns to Hymns, until the Church had accumulated a store of sacred song so vast that it remains the admiration and despair of modern scholars. These works, although exhibiting every stage of construction from the simplest to the most intricate, were all framed in accordance with principles derived from the mediæval conception of melodic combination. The secular songs which these same composers produced in great numbers—Madrigals, Chansons, Villanellas and the like—notwithstanding their greater flexibility and lightness of touch, were also written for chorus, usually unaccompanied, and were theoretically constructed according to the same contrapuntal schemes as the church pieces. Nothing like operas or symphonies existed; there were no orchestras worthy of the name; pianoforte, violin and organ playing in the modern sense had not been dreamed of; solo singing was in its helpless infancy. When we consider, in the light of our present experience, how large a range of emotion that naturally utters itself in tone was left unrepresented through this lack of a proper secular art of music, we can understand the urgency of the demand which, at the close of the sixteenth century, broke down the barriers that hemmed in the currents of musical production and swept music out into the vaster area of universal human interests. The spirit of the Renaissance had led forth all other art forms to share in the multifarious activities and joys of modern life at a time when music was still the satisfied inmate of the cloister. But it was impossible that music also should not sooner or later feel the transfiguring touch of the new human impulse. The placid, austere expression of the clerical style, the indefinite forms, the Gregorian modes precluding free dissonance and regulated chromatic change, were incapable of rendering more than one order of ideas. A completely novel system must be forthcoming or music must confess its impotence to enter into the fuller emotional life which had lately been revealed to mankind.

The genius of Italy was equal to the demand. Usually when any form of art becomes complete a period of degeneracy follows; artists become mere imitators, inspiration and creative power die out, the art becomes a handicraft, new growth appears only in another period or another nation and under altogether different auspices. Such would perhaps have been the case with church music in Italy if a method diametrically opposed to that which had so long prevailed in the Church had not inaugurated a new school and finally extended its conquest into the venerable precincts of the Church itself. The opera and instrumental music—the two currents into which secular music divided—sprang up, as from hidden fountains, right beside the old forms which were even then just attaining their full glory, as if to show that the Italian musical genius so abounded in energy that it could never undergo decay, but when it had gone to its utmost limits in one direction it could instantly strike out in another still more brilliant and productive.

The invention of the opera about the year 1600 is usually looked upon as the event of paramount importance in the transition period of modern music history, yet it was only the most striking symptom of a radical sweeping tendency. Throughout the greater part of the sixteenth century a search had been in progress after a style of music suited to a solo voice, which could lend itself to the portrayal of the change and development of emotion involved in dramatic representation. The folk song, which is only suited to the expression of a single simple frame of mind, was of course inadequate. The old church music was admirably adapted to the expression of the consciousness of man in his relations to the divine—what was wanted was a means of expressing the emotions of man in his relations to his fellow-men. Lyric and dramatic poetry flourished, but no proper lyric or dramatic music. The Renaissance had done its mighty work in all other fields of art, but so far as music was concerned in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a Renaissance did not exist. Many reasons might be given why the spirit of the Renaissance had no appreciable effect in the musical world until late in the sixteenth century. Musical forms are purely subjective in their conception; they find no models or even suggestions in the natural world, and the difficulty of finding the most satisfactory arrangements of tones out of an almost endless number of possible combinations, together with the necessity of constantly new adjustments of the mind in order to appreciate the value of the very forms which itself creates, makes musical development a matter of peculiar slowness and difficulty. The enthusiasm for the antique, which gave a definite direction to the revival of learning and the new ambitions in painting and sculpture, could have little practical value in musical invention, since the ancient music, which would otherwise have been chosen as a guide, had been completely lost. The craving for a style of solo singing suited to dramatic purposes tried to find satisfaction by means that were childishly insufficient. Imitations of folk-songs, the device of singing one part in a Madrigal, while the other parts were played by instruments, were some of the futile efforts to solve the problem. The sense of disappointment broke forth in bitter wrath against the church counterpoint, and a violent conflict raged between the bewildered experimenters and the adherents of the scholastic methods.

The discovery that was to satisfy the longings of a century and create a new art was made in Florence. About the year 1580 a circle of scholars, musicians and amateurs began to hold meetings at the house of a certain Count Bardi, where they discussed, among other learned questions, the nature of the music of the Greeks and the possibility of its restoration. Theorizing was supplemented by experiment, and at last Vincenzo Galilei, followed by Giulio Caccini, hit upon a mode of musical declamation, half speech and half song, which was enthusiastically hailed as the long-lost style employed in the Athenian drama. A somewhat freer and more melodious manner was also admitted in alternation with the dry formless recitation, and these two related methods were employed in the performance of short lyric, half-dramatic monologues. Such were the Monodies of Galilei and the Nuove Musiche of Caccini. More ambitious schemes followed. Mythological masquerades and pastoral comedies, which had held a prominent place in the gorgeous spectacles and pageants of the Italian court festivals ever since the thirteenth century, were provided with settings of the new declamatory music, or *stile recitativo*, and behold the opera was born.

The Florentine inventors of dramatic music builded better than they knew. They had no thought of setting music free upon a new and higher flight; they never dreamed of the consequences of releasing melody from the fetters of counterpoint. Their sole intention was to make poetry more expressive and emphatic by the employment of tones that would heighten the natural inflections of speech, and in which there should be no repetition or extension of words (as in the contrapuntal style) involving a subordination of text to musical form. The ideal of recitative was the expression of feeling by a method that permits the text to follow the natural accent of declamatory speech, unrestrained by a particular musical form or tonality, and dependent only upon the support of the simplest kind of instrumental accompaniment. In this style of music, said Caccini, speech is of the first importance, rhythm second and tone last of all. These pioneers of dramatic music, as they declared over and over again, simply desired a form of music that should allow the words to be distinctly understood. They condemned counterpoint, not on musical grounds, but because it allowed the text to be obscured and the natural rhythm broken. There was no promise of a new musical era in such an anti-musical pronunciamento as this. But a relation between music and poetry in which melody renounces all its inherent rights could not long be maintained. The genius of Italy in the seventeenth century was musical, not poetic. Just so soon as the infinite possibilities of charm that lie in free melody were once perceived, no theories of Platonizing pedants could check its progress. The demands of the new age, reinforced by the special Italian gift of melody, created an art form in which absolute music triumphed over the feebler claims of poetry and rhetoric. The cold, calculated Florentine music-drama gave way to the vivacious impassioned opera of Venice and Naples. Although the primitive dry recitative survived, the far more expressive accompanied recitative was evolved from it, and the grand aria burst into radiant life out of the brief lyrical sections which the Florentines had allowed to creep into their tedious declamatory scenes. Vocal colorature, which had already appeared in the dramatic pieces of Caccini, became the most beloved means of effect. The little group of simple instruments employed in the first Florentine music-dramas was gradually merged in the modern full orchestra. The original notion of making the poetic and scenic intention paramount was forgotten, and the opera became cultivated solely as a means for the display of all the fascinations of vocalism.

Thus a new motive took complete possession of the art of music. By virtue of the new powers revealed to them, composers would now strive to enter all the secret precincts of the soul and give a voice to every emotion, simple or complex, called forth by solitary meditation or by situations of dramatic stress and conflict. Music, like painting and poetry, would now occupy the whole world of human experience. The stupendous achievements of the tonal art of the past two centuries are the outcome of this revolutionary impulse. But not at once could music administer the whole of her new possession. She must pass through a course of training in technic, to a certain extent as she had done in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but under far more favorable conditions and quite different circumstances. The shallowness of the greater part of the music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is partly due to the difficulty that composers found in mastering the new forms. A facility in handling the material must be acquired before there could be any clear consciousness of the possibilities of expression which the new forms contained. The first problem in vocal music was the development of a method of technic, and musical taste, fascinated by the new sensation, ran into an extravagant worship of the human voice. There appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the most brilliant group of singers, of both sexes, that the world has ever seen. The full extent of the morbid, we might almost say the insane passion for sensuous nerve-exciting tone is sufficiently indicated by the encouragement in theatre and church of those outrages upon nature, the male soprano and alto. A school of composers of brilliant melodic genius appeared in Italy, France and Germany, who supplied these singers with showy and pathetic music precisely suited to their peculiar powers. Italian melody and Italian vocalism became the reigning sensation in European society, and the opera easily took the primacy among fashionable amusements. The Italian grand opera, with its solemn travesty of antique characters and scenes, its mock heroics, its stilted conventionalities, its dramatic feebleness and vocal glitter, was a lively reflection of the taste of this age of "gallant" poetry, rococo decoration and social artificiality. The musical element consisted of a succession of arias and duets stitched together by a loose thread of *secco* recitative. The costumes were those of contemporary fashion, although the characters were named for worthies of ancient Greece and Rome. The plots were in no sense historic, but consisted of love tales and conspiracies concocted by the playwright. Truth to human nature and to locality was left to the despised comic opera. Yet we must not suppose that the devotees of this music were conscious of its real superficiality. They adored it not wholly because it was sensational, but because they believed it true in expression; and indeed it was true to those light and transient sentiments which the voluptuaries of the theatre mistook for the throbs of nature. Tender and pathetic these airs often were, but it was the affected tenderness and pathos of fashionable eighteenth century literature which they represented. To the profounder insight of the present they seem to express nothing deeper than the make-believe emotions of children at their play.

Under such sanctions the Italian grand aria became the dominant form of melody. Not the appeal to the intellect and the genuine experiences of the heart was required of the musical performer, but rather brilliancy of technic and seductiveness of tone. Ephemeral nerve excitement, incessant novelty within certain conventional bounds, were the demands laid by the public upon composer and singer. The office of the poet became hardly less mechanical than that of the costumer or the decorator. Composers, with a few exceptions, yielded to the prevailing fashion, and musical dramatic art lent itself chiefly to the portrayal of stereotyped sentiments and the gratification of the sense. I would not be understood as denying the germ of truth that lay in this art element contributed by Italy to the modern world. Its later results were sublime and beneficent, for Italian melody has given direction to well nigh all the magnificent achievements of secular music in the past two centuries. I am speaking here of the first outcome of the infatuation it produced, in the breaking down of the taste for the severe and elevated and the production of a transient, often demoralizing, intoxication.

It was not long before the charming Italian melody undertook the conquest of the Church. The popular demand for melody and solo singing overcame the austere traditions of ecclesiastical song. The dramatic and concert style invaded the choir gallery. The personnel of the choirs was altered and women, sometimes male sopranos and altos, took the place of boys. The prima donna, with her trills and runs, often made the choir gallery the parade ground for her arts of fascination. The chorus declined in favor of the solo, and the church aria vied with the opera aria in bravura and languishing pathos. Where the chorus was retained in Mass, Motet or Hymn, it abandoned the close-knit contrapuntal texture in favor of a simple homophonic structure, with strongly marked rhythmical movement. The orchestral accompaniment also lent to the composition a vivid dramatic coloring, and brilliant solos for violins and flutes seemed often to convert the sanctuary into a concert hall. All this was inevitable, for the Catholic musicians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were artists as well as churchmen; they shared the æsthetic convictions of their time and could not be expected to forego the opportunities for effect which the new methods put into their hands. They were no longer dependent upon the Church for commissions; the opera house and the salon gave them sure means of subsistence and fame. The functions of church and theatre composer were often united in a single man. The convents and cathedral chapels were made training schools for the choir and the opera stage on equal terms. It was in a monk's cell that Bernacchi and other world-famous opera singers of the eighteenth century were educated. Ecclesiastics united with aristocratic laymen in the patronage of the opera; Cardinals and Archbishops owned theatre boxes, and it was not considered in the least out of character for monks and priests to write operas and superintend their performance. Under such conditions it was not strange that church and theatre reacted upon each other, and the sentimental style beloved in opera house and salon should at last be accepted as the proper vehicle of devotional feeling.

In this adornment of the liturgy in theatrical costume we find a singular parallel between the history of church music in the transition period and that of religious painting in the period of the Renaissance. Pictorial art had first to give concrete expression to the conceptions evolved under the influence of Christianity, and since the whole intent of the pious discipline was to turn the thought away from temporal joys, art avoided the representation of ideal physical loveliness on the one hand and a scientific historical correctness on the other. Hence arose the naïve, emblematic pictures of the fourteenth century, whose main endeavor was to attract and indoctrinate with delineations that were symbolic and intended mainly for edification. Art, therefore, although emancipated from Byzantine formalism, was still essentially hieratic, and the painter willingly assumed a semi-sacerdotal office as the efficient coadjutor of the preacher and the confessor. With the fifteenth century came the inrush of the antique culture, uniting with native Italian tendencies to sweep art away into a passionate quest of beauty wherever it might be found. The conventional religious subjects and the traditional modes of treatment could no longer satisfy those whose eyes had been opened to the magnificent materials for artistic treatment that lay in the human form, draped and undraped, in landscape, atmosphere, color and light and shadow, and who had been taught by the individualistic trend of the age that the painter is true to his genius only as he frees himself from formulas and follows the leadings of his own instincts. But art could not wholly renounce its original pious mission. The age was at least nominally Christian, sincerely so in many of its elements, and the patronage of the arts was still to a very large extent in the hands of the clergy. And here the Church prudently consented to a modification of the established ideals of treatment of sacred themes. The native Italian love of elegance of outline, harmony of form and splendor of color, directed by the study of the antique, overcame the earlier austerity and effected a combination of Christian tradition and pagan sensuousness which, in such work as that of Correggio and the great Venetians, and even at times in the pure Raphael and the stern Michael Angelo, quite belied the purpose of ecclesiastical art, aiming not to fortify dogma and elevate the spirit, but to gratify the lust of the eye and the delight in the display of technical skill. Painting no longer conformed to a traditional religious type; it followed its genius, and that genius was really inspired by the splendors of earth, however much it might persuade itself that it ministered to holiness. A noted example of this self-deception, although an extreme one, is the picture entitled "The Marriage at Cana," by Paolo Veronese. Christ is the central figure, but His presence has no vital significance. He is simply an imposing Venetian grandee, and the enormous canvas, with its crowd of figures elegantly attired in fashionable sixteenth century costume, its profusion of sumptuous dishes and gorgeous tapestries, is nothing more or less than a representation of a Venetian state banquet. One painter drew naked young men as a background for a picture of the Madonna and infant Christ. Another painted a St. Sebastian for a nunnery, whose physical charms proved a snare, so that it was removed. Others, such as Titian, lavished all the resources of their art with apparently equal enthusiasm upon Madonnas and nude Venuses. The other direction which was followed by painting, aiming at historical verity and rigid accuracy in anatomy and expression, may be illustrated by comparing Rubens' "Crucifixion" in the Antwerp Museum with a crucifixion, for example, by Fra Angelico. Each motive was sincere, but the harsh realism of the Fleming shows how far art, even in reverent treatment of religious themes, had departed from the unhistoric symbolism formerly imposed by the Church. In all this there was no disloyal intention; art had simply issued its declaration of independence, its sole aim was henceforth beauty and reality, the body as well as the soul seemed worthy of study and adoration, and the Church adopted the new skill into its service, not seeing that the world was destined to be the gainer and not religion.

The same impulse produced analogous results in the music of the Catholic Church. The liturgic texts that were appropriated to choral setting remained as they had been, the place and theoretic function of the musical offices in the ceremonial were not altered, but the music, in imitating the characteristics of the opera and exerting a somewhat similar effect upon the mind, became animated by an ideal of devotion quite apart from that of the liturgy and belied that unimpassioned, absorbed and universalized mood of worship of which the older forms of liturgic art are the most complete and consistent embodiment. Herein is to be found the effect of the spirit of the Renaissance upon church music. It is not simply that it created new musical forms, new styles of performance and a more definite expression; the significance of the change lies rather in the fact that it transformed the whole spirit of devotional music by endowing religious themes with sensuous charm and with a treatment inspired by the arbitrary will of the composer and not by the teachings of the Church.

At this point we reach the real underlying motive, however unconscious of it individual composers may have been, which compelled the revolution in liturgic music. A new ideal of devotional expression made inevitable the abandonment of the formal, academic style of the Palestrina school. The spirit of the age, which required a more subjective expression in music, involved a demand for a more definite characterization in the setting of the sacred texts. The composer could no longer be satisfied with a humble imitation of the forms which the Church had sealed as the proper expression of her attitude toward the divine mysteries, but claimed the privilege of coloring the text according to the dictates of his own feeling as a man and his peculiar method as an artist. The mediæval music was that of the cloister and the chapel. It was elevated, vague, abstract; it was as though it took up into itself all the particular and temporary emotions that might be called forth by the sacred history and articles of belief, and sifted and refined them into a generalized type, special individual experience being dissolved in the more diffused sense of awe and rapture which fills the hearts of an assembly in the attitude of worship. It was the mood of prayer which this music uttered, and that not the prayer of an individual agitated by his own personal hopes and fears, but the prayer of the Church, which embraces all the needs which the believers share in common and offers them at the Mercy Seat with the calmness that comes of reverent confidence. Thus in the old Masses the "Kyrie eleison" and the "Miserere nobis" are never agonizing; the "Crucifixus" does not attempt to portray the grief of an imaginary spectator of the scene on Calvary; the "Gloria in Excelsis" and the "Sanctus" never force the jubilant tone into a frenzied excitement; the setting of the "Dies Irae" in the Requiem Mass makes no attempt to paint a realistic picture of the terrors of the day of judgment. Now compare a typical Mass of the modern dramatic school and see how different is the conception. The music of "Gloria" and "Credo" revels in all the opportunities for change and contrast which the varied text supplies; the "Dona nobis pacem" dies away in strains of tender longing. Consider the mournful undertone that throbs through the "Crucifixus" of Schubert's Mass in A flat, the terrifying crash that breaks into the "Miserere nobis" in the "Gloria" of Beethoven's Mass in D, the tide of ecstasy that surges through the "Sanctus" of Gounod's St. Cecilia Mass and the almost cloying sweetness of the "Agnus Dei;" the uproar of brass instruments in the "Tuba mirum" of Berlioz's Requiem. Observe the strong similarity of style at many points between Verdi's Requiem and his opera "Aida." In such works as these, which are fairly typical of the modern school, the composer writes under an independent impulse, with no thought of subordinating himself to ecclesiastical canons or liturgic usage. He attempts not only to depict his own state of mind as affected by the ideas of the text, but he also often aims to make his music picturesque according to dramatic methods. He does not seem to be aware that there is a distinction between religious concert music and church music. The classic example of this confusion is in the "Dona nobis pacem" of Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis," where the composer introduces a strain of military music in order to suggest the contrasted horrors of war. This device, as Beethoven employs it, is exceedingly striking and beautiful, but it is exactly antagonistic to the meaning of the text and the whole spirit of the liturgy. The conception of a large amount of modern Mass music seems to be not that the ritual to which it belongs is prayer, but rather a splendid spectacle intended to excite the imagination and fascinate the sense. It is this altered conception, lying at the very basis of the larger part of modern church music, that leads such writers as Jakob to refuse even to notice the modern school in his sketch of the history of church music, just as Rio condemns Titian as the painter who mainly contributed to the decay of religious painting.

In the Middle Age artists were grouped in schools or in guilds, each renouncing his right of initiative and shaping his productions in accordance with the legalized formulas of his craft. The modern artist is a separatist, his glory lies in the degree to which he rises above hereditary technic, and throws into his work a magical personal quality which becomes his own creative gift to the world. The church music of the sixteenth century was that of a school; the composers, although not actually members of a guild, worked on exactly the same technical foundations, and produced Masses and Motets of a uniformity that often becomes academic and monotonous. The modern composer carries into church pieces his distinct personal style. The grandeur and violent contrasts of Beethoven's symphonies, the elegiac tone of Schubert's songs, the enchantments of melody and the luxuries of color in the operas of Verdi and Gounod, are also characteristic marks of the Masses of these composers. The older music could follow the text submissively, for there was no prescribed musical form to be worked out, and cadences could occur whenever a sentence came to an end. The modern forms, on the other hand, consisting of consecutive and proportional sections, imply the necessity of contrast, development and climax—an arrangement that is not necessitated by any corresponding system in the text. This alone would often result in a lack of congruence between text and music and the composer would easily fall into the way of paying more heed to the sheer musical working out than to the meaning of the words. Moreover, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there was no radical conflict between the church musical style and the secular; so far as secular music was cultivated by the professional composers it was no more than a slight variation from the ecclesiastical model. Profane music may be said to have been a branch of religious music. In the modern period this relationship is reversed; secular music in opera and instrumental forms has remoulded church music, and the latter is in a sense a branch of the former.

Besides the development of the sectional form another technical change acted to break down the old obstacles to characteristic expression. An essential feature of the mediæval music, consequent upon the very nature of the Gregorian modes, was the very slight employment of chromatic alteration of notes and the absence of free dissonances. Whereas in the modern keys the notes themselves differ (the key of E, for instance, containing notes that are not found in the keys of C or F), the Gregorian modes do not differ in the notes employed, but only in the relation of the intervals to the key-note or final, according to the arrangement of steps and half-steps. Modulation in the modern sense, therefore, cannot exist in a purely diatonic scheme. The breaking up of the modal system was foreshadowed when composers became impatient with the placidity and colorlessness of the modal harmonies and began to introduce unexpected dissonances for the sake of variety. These sharps and flats were employed at first without any regularity whatever, except occasionally to avoid an objectionable progression or to give the effect of a leading tone in a final cadence. The other chromatic changes that occasionally appear in the old music are scattered about in a haphazard fashion; they give an impression of helplessness to the modern ear when the composer seems about to make a modulation and at once falls back again into the former tonality. It was a necessity, therefore, as well as a virtue, that the church music of the old régime should maintain the calm equable flow that seems to us so pertinent to its liturgic intention. For these reasons it may perhaps be replied to what has been said concerning the devotional ideal embodied in the calm, severe strains of the old masters that they had no choice in the matter. Does it follow, it may be asked, that these men would not have written in the modern style if they had had the means? Some of them probably would have done so, others almost certainly would not. Many writers who carried the old form into the seventeenth century did have the choice and resisted it; they staunchly defended the traditional principles and condemned the new methods as destructive of pure church music. The laws that work in the development of ecclesiastical art also seem to require that music should pass through the same stages as those that sculpture and painting traversed—first the stage of symbolism, restraint within certain conventions in accordance with ecclesiastical prescription; afterwards the deliverance from the trammels of school formulas, emancipation from all laws but those of the free determination of individual genius. At this point authority ceases, dictation gives way to persuasion and art still ministers to the higher ends of the Church, not through fear, but through reverence for the teachings and appeals which the Church sends forth as her contribution to the nobler influences of the age.

The writer who would trace the history of the modern musical Mass has a task very different from that which meets the historian of the mediæval period. In the latter case, as has already been shown, generalization is comparatively easy, for we deal with music in which differences of nationality and individual style hardly appear. The modern Catholic music, on the other hand, follows the currents that shape the course of secular music. Where secular music becomes formalized, as in the early Italian opera, religious music tends to fall into a similar routine. When, on the other hand, men of commanding genius, such as Beethoven, Berlioz, Liszt, Verdi, contribute works of a purely individual stamp to the general development of musical art, their church compositions form no exception, but are likewise sharply differentiated from others of the same class. The influence of nationality makes itself felt—there is a style characteristic of Italy, another of S. Germany and Austria, another of Paris, although these distinctions tend to disappear under the solvent of modern cosmopolitanism. The Church does not positively dictate any particular norm or method, and hence local tendencies have run their course almost unchecked.

Catholic music has shared all the fluctuations of European taste. The levity of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries was as apparent in the Mass as in the opera. The grand uplift in the musical culture during the last 100 years has carried church composition along with it, so that almost all the works, produced since Palestrina, of which the Church has most reason to be proud, belong to the present century. One of the ultimate results of the modern license in style and the tendency toward individual expression is the custom of writing Masses as free compositions rather than for liturgic uses, and of performing them in public halls or theatres in the same manner as oratorios. Mozart wrote his Requiem to the order of a private patron. Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis," not being ready when wanted for a consecration ceremony, outgrew the dimensions of a service Mass altogether, and was finished without any liturgic purpose in view. Cherubini's Mass in D minor and Liszt's Gran Mass were each composed for a single occasion, and both of them, like the Requiems of Berlioz and Dvorak, although often heard in concerts, have but very rarely been performed in church worship. Masses have even been written by Protestants, such as Bach, Schumann, Hauptmann, Richter and Becker. Masses that are written under the same impulse as ordinary concert and dramatic works easily violate the ecclesiastical spirit, and pass into the category of religious works that are non-churchly, and it may often seem necessary to class them with cantatas on account of their semi-dramatic tone. In such productions as Bach's B minor Mass, Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis" and Berlioz's Requiem we have works that constitute a separate phase of art, not Masses in the proper sense, for they do not blend with the Church ceremonial nor contribute to the special devotional mood which the Church aims to promote, while yet in their general conception they are held by a loose band to the altar. So apart do these mighty creations stand that they may almost be said to glorify religion in the abstract rather than the confession of the Catholic Church.

The changed conditions in respect to patronage have had the same effect upon the Mass as upon other departments of musical composition. In former periods down to the close of the eighteenth century, the professional composer was almost invariably a salaried officer, attached as a personal retainer to a court, lay or clerical, and bound to conform his style of composition to a greater or less extent to the tastes of his employer. A Pope Sixtus V. could reprove Palestrina for failing to please with a certain Mass and admonish him to do better work in the future. Haydn could hardly venture to introduce any innovation into the style of religious music sanctioned by his august masters, the Esterhazys. Mozart wrote all his Masses, with the exception of the Requiem, for the chapel of the Prince Archbishop of Salzburg. In this establishment the length of the Mass was prescribed, the mode of writing and performance, which had become traditional, hindered freedom of development, and therefore Mozart's works of this class everywhere gave evidence of constraint. On the other hand, the leading composers of the present century that have occupied themselves with the Mass have been free from such arbitrary compulsions. They have written Masses, not as a part of routine duty, but as they were inspired by the holy words and by the desire to offer the free gift of their genius at the altar of the Church. They have been, as a rule, devoted churchmen, but they have felt that they had the sympathy of the Church in asserting the rights of the artist as against prelatical conservatism and local usage. The outcome is seen in a group of works which, whatever the strict censors may deem their defects in edifying quality, at least indicate that in the field of musical art there is no necessary conflict between Catholicism and the free spirit of the age.

Under these very conditions the Mass in the modern musical era has taken a variety of directions and assumed distinct national and individual complexions. The Neapolitan school, which gave the law to Italian opera in the eighteenth century, endowed the Mass with the same soft sensuousness of melody and sentimental pathos of expression, together with a dry calculated kind of harmony in the chorus portions, the work never touching deep chords of feeling, and yet preserving a tone of sobriety and dignity. As cultivated in Italy and France the Mass afterward degenerated into rivalry on equal terms with the shallow, captivating, cloying melody of the later Neapolitans and their successors, Rossini and Bellini. In this school of so-called religious music all sense of appropriateness was often lost, and a florid, profane treatment was not only permitted but encouraged. Perversions which can hardly be called less than blasphemous sometimes had free rein in the ritual music. Franz Liszt, in a letter to a Paris journal, written in 1835, bitterly attacks the music which flaunted itself in the Catholic churches of the city. He complains of the sacrilegious virtuoso displays of the prima donna, the wretched choruses, the vulgar antics of the organist playing galops and variations from comic operas in the most solemn moments of the holy ceremony. Similar testimony has come from time to time from Italy, and it would appear that the most lamentable lapses from the pure church tradition have occurred in some of the very places where one would expect that the strictest principles would be loyally maintained. The most celebrated surviving example of the consequences to which the virtuoso tendencies in church music must inevitably lead when unchecked by a truly pious criticism is Rossini's "Stabat Mater." This frivolous work is frequently performed with great éclat in Catholic places of worship, as though the clergy were indifferent to the almost incredible levity which could clothe the heart-breaking pathos of Jacopone's immortal hymn—a hymn properly honored by the Church with a place among the five great Sequences—with strains properly suited to the sprightly abandon of opera bouffe.

Another branch of the Mass was sent by the Neapolitan school into Austria, and here the results, although unsatisfactory to the better taste of the present time, were far nobler and more fruitful than in Italy and France. The group of Austrian church composers, represented by the two Haydns, Mozart, Eybler, Neukomm, Sechter and others of the period, created a form of church music which partook of much of the dry, formal, pedantic spirit of the day, in which regularity of form, scientific correctness and a conscious propriety of manner were often more considered than emotional fervor. Certain conventions, such as a florid contrapuntal treatment of the Kyrie with its slow introduction followed by an Allegro, the fugues at the "Cum Sanctu Spiritu" and the "Et vitam," the regular alternation of solo and chorus numbers, give the typical Austrian Mass a somewhat rigid perfunctory air, and in practice produce the effect which always results when expression becomes stereotyped and form is exalted over substance. Mozart's Masses, with the exception of the beautiful Requiem (which was his last work and belongs in a different category), were the production of his boyhood, written before his genius became self-assertive and under conditions distinctly unfavorable to the free exercise of the imagination. The Masses of Joseph Haydn stand somewhat apart from the strict Austrian school, for although as a rule they conform externally to the local conventions, they are far more individual and possess a freedom and buoyancy that are decidedly personal. It has become the fashion among the sterner critics of church music to condemn Haydn's Masses without qualification, as conspicuous examples of the degradation of taste in religious art which is one of the depressing legacies of the eighteenth century. Much of this censure is deserved, for Haydn too often loses sight of the law which demands that music should reinforce and not contradict the meaning and purpose of the text. Haydn's Mass style is often indistinguishable from his oratorio style. His colorature arias are always flippant, often introduced at such solemn moments as to be grossly offensive. Even where the voice part is subdued to an appropriate solemnity, the desired impression is frequently destroyed by some tawdry flourish in the orchestra. The brilliancy of the choruses is often pompous and hollow. Haydn's genius was primarily instrumental; he was the virtual creator of the modern symphony and string quartette; his musical forms and modes of expression were drawn from two diverse sources which it was his great mission to conciliate and idealize, viz., the Italian aristocratic opera and the dance and song of the common people. An extraordinary sense of form and an instinctive sympathy with whatever is spontaneous, genial and racy made him what he was. The joviality of his nature was irrepressible. To write music of a sombre cast was out of his power. There is not a melancholy strain in all his works; pensiveness was as deep a note as he could strike. He tried to defend the gay tone of his church music by saying that he had such a sense of the goodness of God that he could not be otherwise than joyful in thinking of Him. This explanation was perfectly sincere, but Haydn was not enough of a philosopher to see the weak spot in this sort of æsthetics. Yet in spite of the obvious faults of Haydn's Mass style, looking at it from an historic point of view, it was a promise of advance and not a sign of degeneracy. For it marked the introduction of genuine, even if misdirected feeling, into worship music in the place of dull conformity to routine. Haydn was far indeed from solving the problem of church music, but he helped to give new life to a form that showed danger of becoming petrified.

Two Masses of world importance rise from above the mediocrity of the Austrian school, like the towers of some Gothic cathedral above the monotonous tiled roofs of a mediæval city—the Requiem of Mozart and the "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven. The unfinished masterpiece of Mozart outsoars all comparison with the religious works of his youth, and as his farewell to the world he could impart to it a tone of pathos and exaltation which had hardly been known in the cold objective treatment of the usual eighteenth century Mass. The hand of death was upon Mozart as he penned the immortal pages of the Requiem, and in this crisis he could feel that he was free from the dictation of fashion and precedent. This work is perhaps not all that we might look for in these solemn circumstances. Mozart's exquisite genius was suited rather to the task, in which lies his true glory, of raising the old Italian opera to its highest possibilities of grace and truth to nature. He had not that depth of feeling and sweep of imagination which make the works of Bach, Handel and Beethoven the sublimest expression of awe in view of the mysteries of life and death. Yet it is absolutely free from the fripperies which disfigure the Masses of Haydn, as well as from the dry scholasticism of much of Mozart's own early religious work. Such movements as the "Confutatis," the "Recordare" and the "Lacrimosa"—movements inexpressibly earnest, consoling and pathetic—gave evidence that a new and loftier spirit had entered the music of the Church.

The "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven, composed 1818-1822, can hardly be considered from the liturgic point of view. In the vastness of its dimensions it is quite disproportioned to the ceremony to which it theoretically belongs, and its almost unparalleled difficulty of execution and the stupendous grandeur of its choral climaxes remove it beyond the reach of all but the most exceptional choirs. It is, therefore, performed only as a concert work by choral societies with a full orchestral equipment. For these reasons it is not to be classed with the service Masses of the Catholic Church, but may be placed beside the B minor Mass of Sebastian Bach, both holding a position outside all ordinary comparisons. Each of these colossal creations stands on its own solitary eminence, the projection in tones of the religious conceptions of two gigantic all-comprehending intellects. For neither of these two works is the Catholic Church strictly responsible. They do not proceed from within the Church. Bach was a strict Protestant; Beethoven, although nominally a disciple of the Catholic Church, had almost no share in her communion, and his religious belief, so far as the testimony goes, was a sort of pantheistic mysticism. Both these supreme artists in the later periods of their careers gave absolutely free rein to their imaginations, and not only well nigh exceeded all available means of performance, but also seemed to strive to force musical forms and the powers of instruments and voices beyond their limits in the efforts to realize that which is unrealizable through any human medium. In this endeavor they went over the verge of the sublime and produced achievements which excite wonder and awe. These two Masses defy all imitation, represent no school and come into comparison not with works of their own nominal class, but rather with Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment," Titian's "Assumption of Madonna" and Dante's "Paradiso." The spirit of individualism in modern religious music can no further go.

The last Masses of international importance produced on Austrian soil are those of Franz Schubert. Of his six Latin Masses four are youthful works, pure and graceful, but not especially significant. In his E flat and A flat Masses, however, he takes a place in the upper rank of Mass composers of this century. The E flat Mass is weakened by the diffuseness which was Schubert's besetting sin; the A flat is more terse and sustained in excellence and thoroughly available for practical use. Both of them contain movements of purest ideal beauty and sincere worshipful spirit, and often rise to a grandeur that is unmarred by sensationalism and wholly in keeping with the tone of awe which pervades even the most exultant moments of the liturgy.

The lofty idealism exemplified in such works as Mozart's Requiem, Beethoven's Mass in D, Schubert's last two Masses and in a less degree in Weber's Mass in E flat has never since been lost from the German Mass in spite of local and temporary reactions. Such composers as Kiel, Havert, Grell and Rheinberger have done noble service in holding German Catholic music fast to the tradition of seriousness and truth which has been taking form all through this century in German secular music. It must be said, however, that the German Catholic Church at large, especially in the country districts, has been too often dull to the righteous claims of the profounder expression of devotional feeling, and has maintained the vogue of the Italian Mass and the shallower products of the Austrian school. Against this indifference the St. Cæcilia Society, founded at Regensburg in 1868, has directed its noble missionary labors, with as yet but partial success.

If we turn our observation to Italy and France we find that the music of the Church is at every period sympathetically responsive to the fluctuations in secular music. Elevated and dignified, if somewhat cold and constrained in the writings of the nobler spirits of the Neapolitan school such as Durante and Jomelli, sweet and graceful even to effeminacy in Pergolesi, sensuous and flippant in Rossini, imposing and massive, rising at times to epic grandeur, in Cherubini, intentionally dramatic and sensational in Lesueur, by turns ecstatic and voluptuous in Gounod, ardent and impassioned in Verdi—the ecclesiastical music of the Latin nations offers works of adorable beauty, sometimes true to the pure devotional ideal, sometimes perverse, and by their isolation serving to illustrate the dependence of the church composer's inspiration upon the general conditions of musical taste and progress. Not only were those musicians of France and Italy who were prominent as church composers also among the leaders in opera (and indeed dramatic and church music were the only forms cultivated with success in these two centuries down to Hector Berlioz), but their ideals and methods in opera were closely paralleled by those displayed in their religious productions. It is impossible to separate the powerful Masses and Requiems of Cherubini, with their pomp and majesty of movement, their reserved and pathetic melody, their grandiose dimensions and their sumptuous orchestration, from those contemporary tendencies in dramatic art which issued in the "historic school" of grand opera as exemplified in the pretentious works of Spontini, Meyerbeer and Auber. They may be said to be the reflection in church art of the hollow splendor of French imperialism. Such an expression, however, may be accused of failing in justice to the undeniable merits of Cherubini's Masses. As a man and as a musician Cherubini commands unbounded respect for his unswerving sincerity in an age of sham, his uncompromising assertion of his dignity as an artist in an age of sycophancy, and the solid worth of his achievement in an age of shallow aims and mediocre results. As a church composer he towers so high above his predecessors of the eighteenth century in respect to learning and imagination that his Masses are not unworthy to stand beside Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis" as auguries of the loftier aims that were soon to prevail in the realm of religious music. His Requiem in C minor, particularly, by reason of its exquisite tenderness, breadth of thought, nobility of expression and avoidance of all excess either of agitation or of gloom, must be ranked among the most admirable modern examples of pure Catholic art.

The aim of Lesueur (1763-1837) to introduce into church music a picturesque and imitative style—which, in spite of much that was striking and attractive in result, must be pronounced a false direction in church music—was characteristically French and was reproduced in such works as Berlioz's Requiem and to a certain extent in the Masses and Psalms of Liszt. The genius of Liszt, notwithstanding his Hungarian birth, was closely akin to the French in his tendency to connect every musical impulse with a picture or with some mental conception that could be grasped in distinct concrete outline. In his youth Liszt, in his despair over the degeneracy of liturgic music in France and its complete separation from the real life of the people, proclaimed the necessity of a *rapprochement* between church music and popular music. In an article written for a Paris journal in 1834, which remains a fragment, he imagined a new style of religious music which should "unite in colossal relations theatre and church, which should be at the same time dramatic and solemn, imposing and simple, festive and earnest, fiery and unconstrained, stormy and reposeful, clear and fervent." These expressions are too vague to serve as a programme for a new art movement. They imply, however, a protest against the one-sided operatic tendency of the day, at the same time indicating the conviction that the problem is not to be solved in a pedantic reaction toward the ancient austere ideal, and yet that the old and new ideals, liturgic appropriateness and characteristic expression, reverence of mood and recognition of the claims of contemporary taste, should in some way be made to harmonize. The man who all his life conceived the theatre as a means of popular education and who strove to realize that conception as court music director at Weimar, would also lament any alienation between the church ceremony and the intellectual and emotional habitudes and inclinations of the people. A devoted churchman reverencing the ancient ecclesiastical tradition, and at the same time a musical artist of the advanced modern type, Liszt's instincts yearned more or less blindly towards an alliance between the sacerdotal conception of religious art and the general artistic spirit of the age. Some such vision evidently floated before his mind in the Masses, Psalms and Oratorios of his later years, as shown in their subjective and reflective character, together with a strong inclination toward the older ecclesiastical forms. These two ideals are probably incompatible; at any rate Liszt did not possess the genius to blend them in a convincing manner.

Among the later ecclesiastical composers of France Gounod shines out conspicuously by virtue of those fascinating melodic gifts which have made the fame of the St. Cæcilia Mass almost conterminous with that of the opera "Faust." Indeed, there is hardly a better example of the modern propensity of the dramatic and religious styles to reflect each other's lineaments than is found in the close parallelism which appears in Gounod's secular and church productions. So pliable, or perhaps we might say so neutral is his art, that a similar quality of melting cadence is made to portray the mutual avowals of love-lorn souls and the raptures of heavenly aspiration. Those who condemn Gounod's religious music on this account as sensuous have some reason on their side, yet no one has ever ventured to accuse Gounod of insincerity, and it may well be that his wide human sympathy saw enough correspondence between the worship of an earthly ideal and that of a heavenly—each implying the abandonment of self-consciousness in the yearning for a happiness that is at the moment the highest conceivable—as to make the musical expression of both essentially similar. This is to say that the composer forgets liturgical claims in behalf of the purely human. This principle no doubt involves the destruction of church music as a distinctive form of art, but it is certain that the world at large, as evinced by the immense popularity of Gounod's religious works, sees no incongruity and does not feel that such usage is profane. Criticism on the part of all but the most austere is disarmed by the pure seraphic beauty which this complacent art of Gounod often reveals. The intoxicating sweetness of his melody and harmony never sinks to a Rossinian flippancy. Of Gounod's reverence for the Church and for its art ideals there can be no question. A man's views of the proper tone of church music will be controlled largely by his temperament, and Gounod's temperament was as warm as an Oriental's. He offered to the Church his best, and as the Magi brought gold, frankincense and myrrh to a babe born among cattle in a stable, so Gounod, with a consecration equally sincere, clothed his prayers in strains so ecstatic that compared with them the most impassioned accents of "Faust" and "Romeo and Juliet" are tame. He was a profound student of Palestrina, Mozart and Cherubini, and strong traces of the styles of these masters are apparent in his works. His most famous Mass, the "St. Cecilia," is inferior in breadth and force to the Mass of the "Sacred Heart." His remaining Masses and Oratorios display occasional flashes of extraordinary brilliancy, but their vigor is spasmodic and easily sinks into commonplace.

Somewhat similar qualities, although far less sensational, are found in the works of that admirable band of organists and church composers that now lend such lustre to the art life of the French capital. The culture of such representatives of this school as Guilmant, Widor, Saint-Saëns, Dubois, Gigout is so solidly based, and their views of religious music so judicious, that the methods and traditions which they are conscientiously engaged in establishing need only the reinforcement of still higher genius to bring forth works which will confer even greater honor upon Catholicism than she has yet received from the devotion of her musical sons in France.

The religious works of Verdi might be characterized in much the same terms as those of Gounod. In Verdi also we have a truly filial devotion to the Catholic Church, united with a temperament easily excited to a white heat when submitted to his musical inspiration, and a genius for melody and seductive harmonic combinations in which he is hardly equaled among modern composers. In his "Manzoni Requiem," "Stabat Mater" and "Te Deum" these qualities are no less in evidence than in "Aida" and "Otello," and it would be idle to deny their devotional sincerity on account of their lavish profusion of nerve-exciting agencies. The controversy between the contemners and the defenders of the "Manzoni Requiem" is now somewhat stale and need not be revived here. Any who may wish to resuscitate it, however, on account of the perennial importance of the question of what constitutes purity and appropriateness in church art, must in justice put themselves into imaginative sympathy with the racial religious feeling of an Italian, and make allowance also for the undeniable suggestion of the dramatic in the Catholic ritual and for the natural effect of the Catholic ceremonial and its peculiar atmosphere upon the more ardent enthusiastic order of minds.

The most imposing contributions that have been made to Catholic liturgic music since Verdi's Requiem are undoubtedly the Requiem Mass and the "Stabat Mater" of Dvorak. All the wealth of tone color which is contained upon the palette of this at present unsurpassed master of harmony and instrumentation has been laid upon these two magnificent scores. Inferior to Verdi in variety and gorgeousness of melody, the Bohemian composer surpasses the great Italian in massiveness, dignity and in unfailing good taste. There can be no question that Dvorak's "Stabat Mater" is supreme over all other settings—the only one, except Verdi's much slighter work, that is worthy of the pathos and tenderness of this immortal Sequence. The Requiem of Dvorak in spite of a tendency to monotony, is a work of exceeding beauty, rising often to grandeur, and is notable, apart from its sheer musical qualities, as the most precious gift to Catholic art that has come from the often rebellious land of Bohemia.

It would be profitless to attempt to predict the future of Catholic church music. In the hasty survey which we have made of the Catholic Mass in the past three centuries we have been able to discover no law of development except the almost unanimous agreement of the chief composers to reject law and employ the sacred text of Scripture and liturgy as the bases of works in which not the common consciousness of the Church shall be expressed, but the emotions aroused by the action of sacred ideas upon different temperaments and divergent artistic methods. There is no sign that this principle of individual liberty will be renounced. Nevertheless, the increasing deference that is paid to authority, the growing study of the works and ideals of the past which is so apparent in the culture of the present day, will here and there issue in partial reactions. The mind of the present, having seen the successful working out of certain modern problems and the barrenness of others, is turning eclectic. Nowhere is this more evident than in the field of musical culture, both religious and secular. We see that in many influential circles the question becomes more and more insistent, what is truth and appropriateness?—whereas formerly the demand was for novelty and "effect." Under this better inspiration many beautiful works are produced which are marked by dignity, moderation and an almost austere reserve, drawing a sharp distinction between the proper ecclesiastical tone and that suited to concert and dramatic music, restoring once more the conception of impersonality, expressing in song the conception of the fathers that the Church is a refuge, a retreat from the tempests of the world, a place of penitence and restoration to confidence in the near presence of heaven. There can be no question, it seems to me, that this is the true ideal of Catholic church music. Such Masses as the "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven, the D minor Mass of Cherubini, the "Messe Solennelle" of Rossini, the "St Cecilia" of Gounod, the Requiems of Berlioz and Verdi, sublime and unspeakably beautiful as they are from the broadly human standpoint, are yet in a certain sense sceptical. They reveal a mood of agitation which is not that intended by the ministrations of the Church in her organized acts of worship. And yet such works will continue to be produced, and the Church will accept them, in grateful recognition of the sincere homage which their creation implies. It is of the nature of the highest artistic genius that it cannot restrain its own fierce impulses out of conformity to a type or external tradition. It will express its own individual emotion or it will become paralyzed and mute. The religious compositions that will humbly yield to a strict liturgical standard in form and expression will be those of writers of the third or fourth grade, just as the church hymns have been, with few exceptions, the production not of the great poets, but of men of lesser artistic endowment, and who were primarily churchmen and only secondarily poets. This will doubtless be the law for all time. The Michael Angelos, the Dantes, the Beethovens will forever break over rules, even though they be the rules of a beloved mother church. Yet the time is past when we may fear any degeneracy like unto that which overtook church music one hundred or more years ago. The principles of such consecrated church musicians as Witt, Perosi, Tinel and the leaders of the St. Cecilia Society and the Schola Cantorum, the influence of the will of the Church implied in all her admonitions on the subject of liturgic song, the growing interest in the study of the masters of the past, and, more than all, the growth of sound views of art as a detail of the higher and popular education, must inevitably promote an increasing conviction among clergy, choir leaders and people of the importance of purity and appropriateness in the music of the Church. The need of reform in many of the Catholic churches of this and other countries is known to every one. Doubtless one cause of the frequent indifference of priests to the condition of choir music in their churches is the knowledge that the chorus and organ are after all but accessories; that the Church possesses in the Gregorian chant a form of song that is the solid, legal, universal and absolutely unchangeable foundation of the musical ceremony, and that any corruption in the gallery music can never by any possibility extend to the heart of the system. The Church is indeed fortunate in the possession of this altar song, the unifying chain which can never be loosened. All the more reason, therefore, why this consciousness of unity should pervade all portions of the ceremony, and the spirit of the liturgic chant should blend even with the large freedom of modern musical forms and methods.

The devotee of Catholic music will be wise if he imitates the prudence of the Church in refraining from dogmatic and intolerant assertion in regard to the style of music proper for worship. All the historic forms employed in the Christian centuries are not equally good, but all have had a reason for existence which is to be found in the inevitable conditions of the periods which produced them. The students and practitioners of church music will be greatly aided in the attainment of true catholicity of judgment by means of the examination of the history of church music through some such method as I have feebly tried to indicate in the series of articles now closed. He will be better able to discover and hold to the good by obeying the apostle's injunction to test all things.

EDWARD DICKINSON.

Oberlin, O.

THOMAS, CARDINAL WOLSEY, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

THE great statesman of the first part of the reign of Henry VIII., Thomas Wolsey, is one of those characters which have always fascinated historians. But as Fiddes says: "There have been few persons, if any, to whom mankind has been obliged for any considerable benefactions that have met with such ungrateful usage in return for them as Cardinal Wolsey. It may be questioned whether in all the histories that are extant a like instance can be found in any nation of so general a prejudice as that under which his name has suffered."[1] Nor has this prejudice been confined to Protestant writers. Indeed we may say that in their hands the memory of the great churchman has suffered less than in those of Catholics, who, not knowing the real state of affairs, have attributed to him the disaster of the Divorce with its subsequent miseries. But Time brings forth strange revenges. A spirit is now abroad which considers bare Truth a virtue in itself; which does not imagine the cause of Religion can be served by a lie, however pious may be the intention. This spirit of historical enquiry, blessed as it is by Leo XIII., who says the Church has nothing to fear from the Truth, is determined to see things as they were and not as that misnamed word "Edification" would have them. We have suffered too much from this policy, and the inevitable result has come about. Those who initiated and furthered that line of action are being found out and their credit is going; and men, no longer children, are unwilling to be led by such guides. They are resenting attempts at keeping out the Light which is now pouring in from all sides. It is not forgotten, to take no other case, how in England Lingard was made to suffer for his honesty and plain speaking. And he has had fellow martyrs in the same cause.

Since access has been granted to the Public State Papers, both in England and abroad, it has become possible to form a true portrait of such a man as Wolsey. We have enough to tell us what the man was doing and why he did it, and to put together from the scattered remnants of the Past a picture sufficiently intelligible in all its main features. Wolsey was by far the greatest statesman England has ever produced; and it is, perhaps, not going beyond what records reveal if we say he was the master-mind of his age. No one could come up to him. Spain was no match, and France was only too glad to obtain his support. For a time he held the destinies of Europe in his hand. He raised England from a third or fourth rate power to the position of arbiter of Christendom, and had for one of his most glorious titles that of *Cardinalis Pacificus*. Grand in his conceptions and magnificent in his dealings, he was the truest servant king ever had. The devotion of men like Wolsey and More to Henry VIII. is somewhat difficult to understand nowadays. It was something more than personal affection, although in his earlier days Henry had a character which won all hearts. It was the fact that he represented the Power from God. He stood for Peace which had returned at last after the Civil Wars of the Roses. To oppose him was considered not only disobedience to the ordinance of God, but risking an opening of old wounds. Henry was the centre of all English nationalism. "Round him revolved all parties with unhesitating obedience; alike those who wished to see him independent of all spiritual control and his authority enlisted in favor of the Reformation, as those who believed such authority was the strongest barrier against dangerous innovation and the surest safeguard for the Church. So both are concerned to magnify the royal authority as much as possible and oppose it as little as they might, not criticizing narrowly Henry's actions or his wishes, but blindly believing that in serving him they were serving the highest interests of the Faith which they professed."[2] This description of the state of affairs will go far to explain much that is difficult for us to understand in days when the importance and rights of the individual are paramount; and Authority itself is happily exposed to the search-light of that wholesome Public Opinion which asserts that those who claim to rule should themselves be worthy of ruling.

---

[1] "The Life of Cardinal Wolsey," p. 111. (Ed. 1726.)

But it is not our purpose to consider the secular work of the great Cardinal of York. This has been done beyond compare by the late Mr. Brewer in the historical Introductions to the Calendars of State Papers (1509-1530) which he edited for the Master of the Rolls.[3] In summing up the character of Wolsey, he says: "In spite of all . . . the Cardinal still remains and will ever remain as the one prominent figure of this period. The interest concentrated in his life, character and actions is not eclipsed by any of his contemporaries. The violent calumnies resting on his memory have in some degree been already lightened by Justice and clearer views of the events of his times and the character of the chief agents. It needs not apprehend an examination still more rigid and more dispassionate. Not free from faults by any means, especially from the faults and failings the least consistent with his ecclesiastical profession, the Cardinal was perfectly free from those meaner though less obtrusive vices which disfigured the age and the men that followed him—vices to which moralists are tolerant and the world indulgent."[4] It is just this "more rigid and more dispassionate" examination we propose to undertake. One side of the character of the Great Cardinal, perhaps as was natural, Mr. Brewer did not understand. And it is this side, the ecclesiastical, with which we are here concerned. Hitherto Wolsey's name has stood for that of a great statesman. He has a higher claim, we think, to be known as a great churchman. "The faults and failings, the least consistent with his ecclesiastical profession," will be found by the student to be but results of the circumstances of his age, instead of departures from the laws of Christian virtue.

---

[2] Brewer: "The Reign of Henry VIII." Vol. II., p. 456. [3] Since Mr. Brewer's death these Introductions have been published separately in two volumes under the title of "The Reign of Henry VIII." 1509-1530.

As we have given the picture of the political feeling of his age, we must also rapidly sketch the state of the Church, at any rate as far as the Popes were concerned. The English Benedictine historian, Dom Gasquet, has recently treated the subject of the "The Eve of the Reformation" and has given us vivid studies of what the people in England were thinking and doing before the Crisis came. To his scholarly pages we refer the reader; and in them he will find that the state of religion in England, the relations of priests and people, the intellectual and moral tone, were all excellent; and that the rock upon which the English church, driven by the storm of the Divorce, split, was not that of a need of reformation in the religion of the English people themselves. We have to bear in mind that the life of Wolsey was spent under the influences of such Popes as Sixtus IV. (1471-84), Innocent VIII. (1484-92), Alexander VI. (1492-1503), Pius III. (1503), Julius II. (1503-13), Leo X. (1513-21), Hadrian VI. (1522-23) and Clement VII. (1523-34). From this list of unworthy Pontiffs the name of Pius III., who only reigned twenty-six days, may perhaps be excepted, and also that of Hadrian VI., who reigned only twenty months and who showed himself alive to the real nature of the priests of the Church.[5] Thus Wolsey's earliest impressions as an ecclesiastic were received during the unfortunate reign of Alexander VI. He saw by the fate of the heroic Savonarola, the last of the prophets, the answer made by the *Curia* to the cries for Reformation of abuses which, for nearly 200 years, had gone up from a long-suffering and distracted Christendom. It will be well to bear this in mind. Moreover, Wolsey saw the realities of the Church sacrificed to the lust of temporal dominion and Popes neglecting that which is God's for what they could get from Cæsar. Writing in the days of the fulness of his power, Wolsey says: "I do not see how it may stand with God's will that the Head of the Church should involve himself in war by joining with temporal princes. Since these leagues in the Pope's name began God hath sent affliction upon the Church and upon Christendom. Contentions to advance particular families have not furthered the Papal dignity."[6]

---

[4] Brewer: "The Reign of Henry VIII.," Vol. II., pp. 457-8.

[5] Adrian VI. told his nuncio, Chieregati, to declare at the Diet of Nuremburg (1522): "We knew that for a long time there have existed many abominations in this Holy See, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in jurisdiction (*mandatis*); all things in short changed and perverted. What we deplored in Alexander VI. should be pointed out. Nor need we wonder that corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the Supreme Pontiff to the inferior prelates. We have all, prelates and ecclesiastics, turned aside each one to his own way; for none of us have done well—no, not one." Raynaldus: Annal Ecc., ed. 1755, Vol. XXXI., p. 396, note 667.)

In Ipswich, the county town of Suffolk, there lived in the reign of Edward IV. (1441-83) two worthy Christian souls, Robert and Joan Wolsey or, as they spelt it, *Wulcy*.[7] According to tradition, they dwelt "in St. Nicholas' parish and street on the left hand going down at the left corner of a little avenue leading to the churchyard."[8] There seems to be absolutely no foundation for the report that Robert Wolsey was a butcher.[9] All the evidence goes to prove that he was a grazier in well-to-do circumstances. Wool at that time was England's chief export, and Suffolk was one of the centres of the trade. Giustinian, the Venetian Ambassador, in his report of 1519, when speaking of the Cardinal simply refers to him as of "low origin."[10] The family appears, from a petition of the Cardinal's nephew to Henry VIII. in 1515,[11] to have been living at Steinfield, an agricultural village twenty-four miles from Ipswich.

To Robert and Joan Wolsey were born several children, three sons and one daughter. One, born probably in March, 1471, was Thomas, the future Cardinal. The exact date of his birth is uncertain. Richard Fiddes, in his "Life of Cardinal Wolsey," gives the above date and he is corroborated by George Cavendish, sometime gentleman-usher to the Cardinal. Cavendish (a first rate authority for what passed under his eyes and who was his master's confidant in the hour of affliction) says that he was fifty-nine in 1530; and, as we shall see, gives a particular reason for making that assertion. In spite of other evidence which disagrees and places the birth somewhere between 1471 and 1476, we are inclined to hold Cavendish's date as being based on an official statement. The day of his birth is not known, but we offer it as a conjecture that he got his name from St. Thomas Aquinas, whose feast falls on March 7.

The Grammar School at Ipswich was founded at least in 1477, and here we know Thomas began his letters. He seems to have been a child gifted with talents of the highest order and with the power of intense application. Such progress did he make that when only eleven years old he was sent to Oxford. There is no reason for supposing that any one else than his father paid for his university expenses, though Anthony Wood speaks of "other good friends" as helping.

---

[6] Wolsey to Clerk (16 Jan., 1525.) See Brewer: "State Papers of Henry VIII.," Vol. IV., Part 1, No. 1017. (Quoted hereafter as "Brewer." [7] It is not an uncommon name in early English days and is of Teutonic origin. It is probably the same as Wolseley, the *Wolf-slayer*. [8] Gough's Camden's "Brit.," Vol. II., 85. (Ed. 1789.) [9] It is said that Charles V. said of Buckingham's execution (1521) that the best "Buck" in England had been slain by a butcher's dog, Henry being the butcher and Wolsey the servant. This may account for the idle tale concerning Wolsey's parentage. [10] "Calendar of Venetian State Papers," Vol. II., p. 560. [11] Brewer, II., N. 1368.

Wolsey entered at St. Mary Magdalen's College,[12] which had been founded by the pious Bishop Waynfleet some forty years before. The present building was begun on May 5, 1473, when Wolsey was but an infant. Once entered, the boy lost no time, and in the words of Cavendish: "He prospered so in learning that as he told me (in) his own person, he was called the Boy-bachelor; for as much as he was made Bachelor of Arts at fifteen years of age, which was a rare thing and seldom seen."[13] This was in 1485, two years after he became master. The old world system of education by the Trivials and quatrivials was then in full force, and Wolsey made a name for himself in the art of Disputation which was necessary for taking a degree. He had then to choose either the course of Law or Divinity to qualify for the doctorate, and it is worth noticing that the one who was destined, as Lord Chancellor, to initiate many a reform in legal procedure did not follow the course of Law, but chose the ecclesiastical subject of Divinity and applied himself so ardently to the study of St. Thomas that he became noted for his knowledge. Even his arch-enemy, Polydore Vergil, is obliged to allow he was *in Divinis litteris non indoctus.* So brilliant a scholar was an honor to his college and he was therefore elected Fellow. These fellowships were preparatory to ordination for which they gave a title. But of the date of his fellowship we are not certain. For the College records are silent about him till the year 1497, when in a *Liber Nominum,* or Dinner-Book, of that date he appears as a Master of Arts and fourteenth on the list of Fellows; and as there are the names of four or five other Fellows after his, it is probable that he had been elected Fellow some two or three years previously. In the *Liber Computi* for 1498 we find his name as holding the position of third Bursar.[14]

In connection with the College of St. Mary Magdalen was a common grammar school founded in 1456, and to this Wolsey was appointed schoolmaster. According to the *Liber Computi,* he held the post for only six months and succeeded one Scarbott. But he also held the position of tutor in his college, and thus got into the larger world for which his abilities so well qualified him. "The Lord Marquis Dorset had three of his sons at school there with him, committing as well unto him their virtuous education as their instruction and learning."[15]

---

[12] From the imperfect state of the Records it is not known whether he was admitted as a chorister, servitor, demy or commoner. [13] "Life of Cardinal Wolsey," (Ed. Singer), pp. 4-5.
[14] Bloxam's "Register of St. Mary Magdalen's College," Oxford (1857), p. 25.

Wolsey was already twenty-five when his father died, and at that time he was not yet a priest. A few days before his father died, in the autumn of 1496, he made his will, in which he says: "Item, I will that if Thomas my son be a priest within a year next after my decease, then I will that he sing[16] for me and my friends by the space of a year, and he for to have for his salary 10 marks;[17] and if the said Thomas my son be not a priest, then I will that another honest priest sing for me and my friends the term aforesaid, and he to have the salary of 10 marks." Thomas was appointed one of the executors of the will, under which he received no other legacy than the official one. It would seem from this that Wolsey was not yet in sacred orders. He had reached the canonical age for the priesthood, and in those pre-Tridentine days interstices were not observed. It speaks for his righteousness that the bequest did not make him take any step to secure it. It was "another honest priest" who said the Masses and received the 10 marks; for it was not until the Lenten ordinations of 1498, held in the parish church of St. Peter at Marlborough by Bishop Augustin Church, titular of Lydda and suffragan to John Blyth of Sarum, that Wolsey was ordained priest. In the Register of John Blyth there is entered, on folio 113, the following: *"M. Thomas Wolsey artium magister Norwicen. dioc diaconus socius perpetuus collegii beatae Mariae Mag. Universitatis Oxon. per literas, etc., ad titulum ejusdem collegii, in presbyterum, etc."*[18]

In 1499 Wolsey was elected senior bursar to his college, and under him the tower, so loved by all who know Oxford, was finished.[19] That same year, 1499, at the Christmas vacation which began on *O. Sapientia*[20] (Dec. 17), he received an invitation from the Marquis of Dorset to spend the holidays with his pupils at Bradgate Park, seven miles to the west of Leicester, where in late years that hapless victim of others' ambition, Lady Jane Gray, was born. Cavendish, in his quaint style, thus relates what occurred: "It pleased the said Marquis against a Christmas season to send as well for the schoolmaster as for his children, home to his house, for their recreation in that pleasant and honourable feast. They being then there, my lord, their father, perceived them to be right well employed in learning for their time; which contented him so well that he, having a benefice in his gift, being at that time void, gave the same to the schoolmaster in reward for his diligence, at his departing after Christmas upon his return to the University."[21] The living thus bestowed on Wolsey was the quiet one of Lymington, in the county of Somerset and Diocese of Bath and Wells. The village is situated about one and a half miles east of Ilchester, where Roger Bacon, the famous gray friar, was born.[22] As he had to finish the University year,[23] it was not until October of 1500 that "having the presentation thereof (he) repaired to the Ordinary for his institution and induction; then being fully furnished of all necessary instruments at the Ordinary's hands for his preferments, he made speed without further delay to the said benefice to take thereof possession."[24] He was instituted October 10, 1500.

---

[15] Cavendish, p. 5. [16] i. e., "Missas canere." [17] About £60 of present money. [18] The *English Historical Magazine*, Vol. IX., p. 709. [19] It had been begun in 1492. [20] See "Munimenta Academica," (Roll Series), II, 447.

Hardly had he been inducted and had time to settle down, that is to say in the summer of 1501, than there happened to the new parish priest one of those incidences of which the bare fact is known and the cause is wrapped in obscurity. The fact is related by Cavendish in these words: "One Sir Amyas Pawlet, knight, dwelling in the county thereabouts, took an occasion of displeasure against him, upon what ground I know not, but, sir, by your leave, he was so bold to set the schoolmaster by the feet during his pleasure."[25] In other words, the new parish priest was subjected to the indignity of being set in the public stocks. This is all we really know of the circumstance. After his fall the friends of the New Learning in religion, who were also of the Boleyn interest, spared no means of insulting the great Cardinal's memory. It was said, and the tale seems to read no further back than Sir John Harrington (1561-1612),[26] that Wolsey had been drunk at a village fair. From all we know of the man, his intense application, power of detail and administration, nay, even his desire to stand well with those who could advance him, and his incessant bad health, we are at once led to reject such a tale. At no time, before or after this event, has drunkenness or the slightest approach to such a thing ever been brought against him by contemporary witness. Another tradition of like malice has it he was thus punished for the sin of incontinency. Sir Roger Wilbraham, master of requests to Elizabeth, says so, but this is by no means first hand nor is it an unbiased testimony, for a courtier of Anne Boleyn's daughter is not likely to speak favorably of Wolsey. Moreover, it must be remembered that in the days of his greatness his enemies never dared to bring up the subject of the stocks against him. His subsequent action proves also that in the occurrence there was nothing to his discredit, for when Chancellor of England (1515) he sent for Sir Amyas Paulett, "and after many sharp and heinous words enjoined him to attend upon the Council until he were by them dismissed and not to depart without license upon an urgent pain and forfeiture."[27] Had there been any shameful fault on the part of the parish priest, Wolsey was far too prudent to have stirred up muddy waters and far too just to have punished the knight. Neither would it have been in accordance with the details of the most ordinary common sense had Wolsey been at fault to have kept Sir Amyas in London at large for five or six years and free to spread abroad anything to the discredit of the Chancellor. The only punishment meted out to the knight was the "sharp and heinous words" and an enforced residence in London, where, in 1521, we find him holding the honorable position of Treasurer of the Middle Temple, a post, by-the-bye, he could hardly have held in opposition to the will of the powerful Lord Chancellor. Whatever the cause of the indignity may have been, Sir Amyas seems to have admitted his own fault and to have tried to atone for it in a way soothing to Wolsey's feelings. During his residence in London the knight rebuilt the Gate-house of the Middle Temple and decorated it with Wolsey's arms, badges and cognizances.[28]

---

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

[22] The church dedicated to St. Mary is of thirteenth century work and has a nave 87 feet by 24. It is stone-vaulted. A perpendicular tower stands at the west end, and on the north side is a chantry (dedicated to St. Leonard) which belongs to the Gurney family. An old oak bench is said to exist with Wolsey's cipher carved thereon.

[23] His term of office as Senior Bursar was from 29th September, 1499, to the same day in 1500.

[24] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

[25] Ibid, p. 6. Hinton St. George, the seat of Earl Poulett, is to the southwest of Lymington, and Sir Amyas (d. 1537) was the grandfather of the gaoler of Mary, Queen of Scots.

[26] "Brief View of the State of the Church of England" (Ed. 1653), p. 184.

What was really the cause of Wolsey being set in the stocks will probably never be known. We have given the adverse tradition, but it must be remembered there is also another. Thomas Storer (1571-1604), in his metrical "Life and Death of Thomas Wolsey," says that the parish priest was the injured party:

> "Wronged by a knight for no desert of mine."

If we may be allowed to add to the conjectures it was very likely the result of a quarrel between the rich man and the vicar, such as are not unknown even in these days. The quarrel increased and at last the knight won a temporary triumph by inflicting insult by force. It was probably for some gross injustice like this that Lord Chancellor Wolsey, who was noted for sternness in dealing with cases of oppression, thought it well in after years to rebuke him with "many sharp and heinous words."

No sooner was he inducted into his living at Lymington than other preferments came upon him. He applied for dispensation to hold certain extra benefices, and this was granted on November 3, 1500. As Wolsey was a noted pluralist, perhaps a word might not be amiss as to this practice. Pluralism or ecclesiastical bigamy has always been against the law, but the great offenders were the Popes of the time, who, to take no other example than England, were accustomed to reward their Italian agents with benefices in this country which they never saw. What is known as the Avignon system of finance became a well developed system of plundering the Church at large for the benefit of the Roman *Curia* in its temporal pretensions. The necessary duties attached to benefices were performed by others who received a small pay, whilst the rest of the income went out of the country. And it sometimes happened that money received in this way from one country was lent by the Pope to help another nation then at war with it.[29] So great had the scandal become that at the Council of Trent a strenuous attempt was made to declare the obligation of residence a divine precept, and to put down so many abuses connected with this traffic. But the first proposition was thwarted by the Italian prelates, who were in the majority and who acted in accordance with the instructions received from the *Curia*. In England long before the time of Wolsey the Civil Power had taken the matter in hand and measures were passed to check the system of Papal provisions. But the nation having vindicated its right, still allowed in practice the Popes to have a free hand in otherwise disposing of moneys left by Englishmen for the benefit of religion in their own country. It is worthy of remark that England always acted towards the Holy See in a most generous and filial manner, and often to her own immediate detriment she allowed the Popes, in temporal matters, to exercise a power which in Spain, in France and Germany was sternly disallowed. If Wolsey fell in with the prevailing practice of pluralities, sanctioned and encouraged as they were by the *Curia*, who profited by the money the dispensations cost, one can say at least that he was no worse than his neighbors. And perhaps we shall find that the moneys accruing to him from pluralities was better spent for the purposes of religion than were the wars of Julius II., which exhausted the Papal treasury.

---

[27] Cavendish, p. 6. [28] The Gate-house was burnt down in 1666.

His patron, the Marquis of Dorset, died September 20, 1501. Wolsey must have been already known favorably[30] to the high dignitaries of the English Church, for, by the end of 1501, we find him one of the Chaplains of Henry Deane, Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor of England. But this appointment did not last long. The Archbishop was old. He resigned the Great Seal July 17, 1502, and seven months afterwards died (February 15,

---

[29] Clement VI. lent enormous sums to the French King during the long war. He used to say: "My predecessors did not know how to be Popes." See Pastor's "History of the Popes" (English Ed.), Vol. I., p. 92. [30] He knew at Oxford Thomas More, Erasmus and Grocyn.

1503). Wolsey and another were appointed to carry out the funeral ceremonies of the primate of all England. A short while after Deane's death Wolsey was at Calais with "Sir John Nanphant, a very grave and ancient knight, who had a great room in Calais under King Henry VII. This knight he served and behaved so discreetly and justly that he obtained the special favor of his said master, in so much that for his wit, gravity and just behavior he committed all the charge of his office unto his chaplain, and as I understand the office was the treasurership of Calais, who was in consideration of his great age discharged of his chargable room and returned again into England intending to live more at quiet. And through his instant labor and especial favor, his chaplain was promoted to the king's service and made his chaplain."[31]

It was in 1505 or 1506 that Wolsey first came into direct relations with the court. The ability he had shown at Calais could not fail to impress Sir John Nanphant, whose recommendation told with the king. Truth to tell, Wolsey was a born administrator, and he knew his powers. There was no false humility about the man. He felt he had it in him—if he had the chance—to serve his country; and he was determined to make the best of any opportunity that presented itself for his advancement. "For many times he used to say: If he could get but one foot in the court, he did not doubt but to obtain anything he could wish for."[32] Some folk would call this ambition; others a healthy, plain, commonsense view of his own capabilities.

He became one of the king's chaplains and had to say Mass before his royal master. "And that done he spent not the day forth in idleness, but gave his attendance upon those whom he thought to bear most rule in the Council and to be most in favor of the king, the which at that time were Doctor Fox, Bishop of Winchester, then Secretary and Lord Privy Seal, and also Sir Thomas Lovell, knight, a very sage counsellor and witty, being master of the king's wards and constable of the Tower."[33]

Wolsey knew how to choose his friends and how to keep them. The friendship thus begun at court with Bishop Fox, one of the saintliest prelates of his age, was of a deep and lasting nature; and the admiration of the old man in his retirement for the younger and more able churchman is one of the beautiful side lights of history. His friends saw his power and recommended him to the king as a fitting and trusty messenger for a certain mission then to be sent to the Emperor Maximilian concerning Henry's proposed marriage with Margaret of Spain (1507). How Wolsey went to Flanders, executed the mission and returned before the king even knew that he had started is a story well known. For his services he was made Dean of Lincoln (February 2, 1508), and six days after was presented with one of the most valuable prebends in the same cathedral, which, however, was soon exchanged for a more valuable one. He was installed, by proxy, into the deanery on Lady Day, but not until two years had passed did he personally take possession. Among the preferments which were showered upon the rising man was the Rectory of Redgrave in Suffolk by the Benedictine Abbot of St. Edmunds (1506), the vicarage of Lydd in Kent by the Cistercian Abbot of Tintern (1508), the post of Royal Almoner (November 3, 1508), and a prebend in Hereford Cathedral (July, 1510). His original benefice at Lymington was resigned some time before July 2, 1508.

---

[31] *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. [32] "The Reign of Henry VIII.," I., p. 298. [33] Cavendish, p. 9.

Henry VII. died April 22, 1509, and was immediately succeeded by his second and only surviving son, Henry VIII., then a young man of eighteen years of age and full of promise. Wolsey was, of course, known at court; but it seems that it was one of his old pupils, the young Marquis of Dorset, a favorite of the young king's, who first introduced him to the particular notice of Henry,[34] who day by day came to appreciate his worth more and more. At court, where Wolsey was now firmly established, he displayed "that natural dignity of manner or aspect which no art can imitate and which no rule or practice will ever be able to form."[35] "Fashioned to much honor from his cradle," as Shakespeare says, Wolsey by his handsome face, majestic figure and winning expression of countenance was sure to make his mark. He was graced, too, with "a special gift of natural eloquence, with a filed tongue to express the same, so that he was able to persuade and allure all men to his purpose,"[36] a trait happily hit off in the lines:

> "He was a scholar and a ripe and good one;
> Exceeding wise, fair spoken and persuading:
> Lofty and sour to them that loved him not,
> But to those that sought him sweet as summer."[37]

The first preferment he seems to have received directly from his new master was on November 27, 1510, when he was presented to the parish church of Great Torrington in the Diocese of Exeter;[38] the next year saw him Registrar of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and February 17, 1511, canon and prebendary of St. George's Chapel at Windsor.[39] On January 16, 1512, Cardinal Bainbridge, then in Rome, made him a prebendary in York Cathedral. Nine months after, through the good offices of Bishop Fox and the Earl of Shrewesbury, the deanery of the Collegiate Church of St.

---

[34] Campbell's "Lives of the Lord Chancellor," Vol. I., p. 445. [35] Fiddes, p. 11. [36] Cavendish, pp. 21-22. [37] "Henry VIII.," act iv., s. 2. [38] Brewer, I., n. 1359. [39] Rymer: "Fœdera," XIII., 293.

Stephen's, in Westminster Palace, was Wolsey's; and on February 19, 1513, he became Dean of York and received the rich benefice of the Precentorship of St. Paul's Cathedral. Henry appointed him Bishop of Tournai, but before taking possession of the see the Diocese of Lincoln became vacant early in 1514 by the death of William Smith. The yearly income of the see was worth £896 18s. 1d., which equals in the money of to-day considerably more than £10,000. The bull for Wolsey's appointment to Lincoln was issued by Leo X., and is dated February 6, 1514;[40] and on the following day the Pope wrote to the king (who had asked that the heavy fees demanded by the *Curia* for the expedition of bulls might be in part remitted in this case), and informed His Majesty that he could not comply with the request, as it had been rejected by the College of Cardinals as detrimental to the Holy See.[41] It was on occasion of his appointment to Lincoln that Wolsey first appears to have come into contact with Julius, Cardinal de Medici, afterwards Clement VII., who wrote a special letter to say that he rejoiced to hear of Wolsey's elevation.[42] Wolsey was evidently looked upon as a rising man, who had to be cultivated; for, as one of the Popes is reported to have said: "Truly England is our storehouse of delights, a very inexhaustible well; and where much abounds much can be extorted from many."[43] A letter of Sylvester de Giglis, the English agent in Rome, throws a light upon matters concerning this appointment. Writing on February 11, 1514, to Wolsey, he says: "The consistory would not listen to the application (for the diminution of the *annates*,[44] saying that the church (of Lincoln) was very rich and had always paid the tax. The Pope, whose portion amounted to 1,700 ducats, asserted that he had nothing except *annates* for his support, as he received nothing from . . . as his predecessors did, and is much in debt for his coronation and his intolerable daily expenses. . . . The Pope, however, will forego the *annates* for the deanery of St. Stephen's. The expediting of the bulls amounts to 6,821 ducats 10 cat. The officials are angry with him for having brought it down so low."[45]

Wolsey was consecrated on March 26, 1514, by William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and at once gave up most of his other benefices. He was never enthroned in his Cathedral, nor did he personally visit it; for, before the year was out, Cardinal Bainbridge, Archbishop of York, was poisoned and the new Bishop of

---

[40] Rymer, XIII., 390. [41] Brewer, I., n. 4724. [42] Cotton MS., Vitell. B. II., 64. As soon as Julius, who was cousin to Leo X., was made Cardinal he wrote at once to offer his services to the English King. [43] Matthew Paris: "Chronica Majora," (Roll Series), IV., pp. 546-7. [44] The first year's income, which the *Curia* now demanded from every newly appointed bishop and high official. [45] Vitell, B. II., 66. The sum comes to about £17,496 in modern value.

Lincoln by August 5 was Elect of York.[46] Thus in one year three bishoprics fell upon Wolsey.

But already, while Bishop of Lincoln, Wolsey was interested in negotiations Henry had begun at Rome to secure the Cardinal's hat for his Minister; and Polydore Vergil, the sub-collector of the Papal dues in England (May 21, 1514), wrote to tell him that on returning to Rome he had sounded the Cardinal of Bath and asked him to use his influence with the Pope to secure his elevation to the Cardinalate. Leo thought it would be expedient, as Wolsey had great authority with the king, to make him a Cardinal. The matter was so to be arranged that it was to appear that it was the spontaneous proposition of the Pope.[47] From this letter, if Polydore Vergil can be trusted, it would seem that Henry did not know of the proposal which appears to have emanated in the first place from Wolsey himself. But it was not long before Henry himself wrote to Leo (August 12, 1514) requesting that Wolsey should be raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate, and he bore witness that he esteemed Wolsey above all his dearest friends and could do nothing of the least importance without him.[48]

Elect of York, Wolsey had reached the highest position save one in the English Church. York was primate of England, while Canterbury was primate of All England. There had been a long-standing quarrel for precedence between the two metropolitans. But that was an old story in Wolsey's time, and the precedency of Canterbury had been settled. The election of Wolsey to York meant more bulls, and consequently more money to the *Curia*. As Elect of York Wolsey entered into a bond (August 18, 1514) with Anthony de Vivaldis of Genoa, W. Botry, mercer, and Tho. Raymond, grocer of London, whereby they engaged to pay for Wolsey's pallium and the expenses for his promotion in the Court of Rome the sum of £2,000.[49] In due course, after the fees were paid, the Pope issued the bulls (September 15, 1514) and sent the Pall as the sign of archiepiscopal jurisdiction.[50]

But now the matter of the Cardinalate was pressing. Leo wrote to Henry (September 24, 1514) in reply to his request, saying the honor the king desired for Wolsey was surrounded with difficulties. It was much desired, and admitted the wearer at once to the highest rank. He promised, however, to comply with the king's wishes at a suitable time.[51] What some of the difficulties were may be gathered from the diary of de Grassis, Papal Master of Ceremonies, who says: "Men say that an English Cardinal ought not to be created lightly, because the English behave themselves insolently in that dignity, as was shown in the case of Cardinal Bainbridge, just dead. Moreover, as Wolsey is the intimate friend of the king, he will not be content with the Cardinalate alone, but as is the custom for those barbarians, will wish to have the office of Legate over all England. If this is granted, the influence of the Roman *Curia* will be at an end; if it be not granted, the Cardinal will be the Pope's enemy and will favor France."[52]

---

[46] Rymer, XIII., 411. [47] Vitell, B. II., 76. [48] Add. MS., 15,387, f. 25. [49] Brewer, I., n. 5334. [50] Rymer, XIII., 450. [51] Brewer, I., n. 5445.

Already it seems to have been known in Rome that Wolsey, though a "barbarian," was a man who had the strength of his convictions and was able, if need be, to take up a position not agreeable to the worldly traditions which ruled the *Curia*. What was dreaded above all things was a reform of abuses.

Pastor, in his "History of the Popes," does not hesitate to say that it was the Italians, whose incomes in great part depended on abuses, who like a leaden weight impeded every movement in the direction of reform;[53] and he quotes the German Carthusian Jacob von Jüterbogk as saying that "no nation in Christendom offers such opposition to reform as Italy; and this from love of gain and worldly profit and fear of losing its privileges."[54] Wolsey saw this as well. He was already in a high position as Archbishop of York, and he knew quite well that he was hated and feared in the *Curia*. But quietly and firmly he put on the screw in the matter of the Cardinalate. There were interests of religion in England that demanded attention quite as much as the welfare of Italian ecclesiastics. He knew very well the sort of people he had to contend with, and he also knew the only arguments that would have any effect. And these he used to the utmost. If nothing could be done at Rome without bribery, one cannot blame those who made use of these means. The blame lies on those who made it necessary. Leo X., who had a personal hatred against the great Archbishop, tried compromise. How would it be, he suggested, if Wolsey became Cardinal and lived in Rome?[55] This would put a stop at any rate to reformation in England. Then the offer was made that Wolsey should receive a bull of promotion on condition he did not carry the *insignia* publicly.[56] But the shifts would not serve. At last, according to de Giglis (April 25, 1515), Leo asserted that the promotion could not take place for the present without the greatest scandal.[57] Meanwhile political reasons made the Pope change his mind. The French king, Francis, was threatening an invasion of Italy, and the help of Henry was sorely needed. The Pope had been informed (July, 1515) that "the king's grace marveled that he delayed so long the sending of the red hat, seeing how tenderly, instantly and often His Grace had written to His Holiness for the same;" and a message had been sent by Wolsey that "if the king forsake the Pope he will be in greater danger on this day two years than ever was Pope Julius."[58] Francis was already at Milan, so by the beginning of August Wolsey knew that Leo had given way. Early in September Wolsey heard from Rome that "the Pope was so on fire that he will insist on his promotion in spite of all the Cardinals,"[59] whom he summoned from their vacations for a consistory. At last, on September 10, Leo notified Wolsey that the creation had taken place, and in ten days[60] a king's courier arrived in London with the important document. The Cardinal's hat, together with a valuable ring, was sent over in the care of Boniface Collis, "*S. D. N. Scutifer*," and secretary to de Giglis. With extraordinary pomp and splendor Wolsey received at Westminster Abbey, on November 18, the *insignia* of his new dignity, together with the title of St. Cecilia beyond the Tiber.

---

[52] Quoted in Creighton's "Wolsey," pp. 39-40. [53] Vol. II., p. 48. [54] Ibid. [55] "Pace to Wolsey." Ellis' Original Letters, II., 1, 178. [56] P. R. O. [57] Cotton MS. Vitell, B. II., 138.

So far had Wolsey succeeded. He had been set in a position which gave him honorary precedence over the See of Canterbury; but in order to carry out what he seems already to have planned, a far greater position and powers more ample were needed. His master mind had seen the disease, and he also saw that the remedy must be applied by one man. He alone was the one man in England capable by genius, power and energy of carrying out the work. No sooner did he know that the Pope had consented to make him Cardinal than he applied at once to be made Legate of the Holy See; or, if Leo made difficulties in giving Papal powers, his agent was to press at least for faculties for making a visitation over monasteries even the exempt.[61] Were he created legate he would have supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the land and would supersede in authority every other ordinary, including even Canterbury, the Primate of All England. It was no mere vulgar love of power which animated the Cardinal. He had set a work before him, and to do this he had to be unrestricted except by his conscience. He valued ecclesiastical dignities as so many means for advancing the end he had in view. They were to him occasions of more work and more responsibilities. How highly he esteemed the dignity of a Cardinalate is shown by his reply to the Venetian Ambassador (January 2, 1516), when he said: "We would prefer not being honored with the dignity rather than do what is unworthy of it."[62]

Meanwhile Leo's dislike of Wolsey increased. In the Spanish State papers of the period we have reports of the Imperial Ambassador at Rome, in which we catch glimpses of the political shifts to which Leo was reduced. Writing June 13, 1520, Juan Mainel says: "The statesmen in Rome are persuaded that the Cardinal will do what is most lucrative for himself; and the Pope *(said)* to him (the Ambassador) that the Cardinal, who is the governor of the King of England, is a very strange person and makes the king go hither and thither just as he likes."[63] This is so absurdly in opposisition to all the facts, as they are now disclosed to us, that one sees what Cardinal Manning said was true three hundred years ago, viz.: "I hardly know in Rome a man high or low who understands the position of the Church in England."[64] Writing again on the 5th of July, 1520, he refers to the Pope's dislike of the Cardinal: "Although there is no man on the face of the earth whom His Holiness detests so heartily as the Cardinal, he will be constituted Legate if the Pope is given to understand that in no other way can he get out of the difficulties in which he is placed."[65] And on the same day he writes again: "The Cardinal of England is much disliked at Rome."[66] And the endeavors of Wolsey to persuade the Pope to send him a commission empowering him to reconcile the Holy Father with all the Christian princes instead of pleasing the Vicar of the Prince of Peace did not even get a civil answer.[67]

---

[58] "Wolsey to de Giglis," ibid, No. 132. [59] No. 160. [60] "Dispatches of Sebastian Giustinian," p. 128. [61] Cotton MS. Vitell, B. II., 153. [62] Calendar of Venetian State Papers, II., n. 671.

Leo, who was driven almost mad with fear, was "reputed to be very feeble in ecclesiastical matters but very constant in political affairs,"[68] now gave himself over to be ruled in all matters ecclesiastical and political by the Emperor on condition that his enemies, the French, were attacked.[69] He had no desire for peace, for he knew that if the negotiations then proceeding at Calais came to anything neither the Church,[70] nor his person, nor the family of the Medici would be safe from the attacks of France. He was determined, he said, to spend as much as he had, and even more, to prevent the Emperor from being so grossly imposed upon and abused in his dignity by the Cardinal of England;[71] and in his fear tried to kill the cat by proposing that some one should show Henry what sort of person Wolsey was.[72]

With these feelings against Wolsey, it is no wonder that Leo for a long time demurred granting the Legateship. The one thing which did not seem to enter at all into his calculation was whether the Legateship would be to the advantage of the Church. He only thought of playing off the Emperor against his enemies, the French; and the Legateship was made simply a matter of political advantage. While he was thus hesitating Wolsey increased his power by receiving, on Christmas Eve, 1515, at the king's express command, the great Seal of England as Lord Chancellor in succession to Warham, who, of his own accord, resigned the charge. It has been the fashion to insinuate a rivalry between these two illustrious men. We have not been able to find any real grounds for such a supposition; on the contrary, Warham, an old man, and wearied out with secular employment, was only too glad to retire to a learned and scholarly retreat. From the documents that remain we can see the excellent and more than friendly terms upon which they stood one towards the other. The new position Wolsey had, and was to have, in law made him supreme; and no doubt, in asserting it, as he was obliged to do, official difficulties arose which their mutual friendship soon settled. But naturally there were officious friends of Warham's, or rather enemies of Wolsey's, who did their best to set one Archbishop against the other. But without success. Each was too magnanimous to bear jealousy, and if, at times, the older prelate doubted or hesitated about accepting the more energetic doings of the younger man, this was only in the nature of things.

---

[63] Bergoroth's Spanish State Papers, Vol. II., No. 281. [64] Purcell: "Life of Cardinal Manning," Vol. II., p. 741. [65] Bergeroth, II., n. 283. [66] Ibid, n. 284. [67] Ibid, 285. [68] Ibid, n. 312; 288. [69] Ibid, 286. [70] That is of course the local Church of Rome. [71] Ibid, 2358. [72] Ibid, 359.

Leo still held back about the Legateship. In November, 1517, a bull was issued to Wolsey relating to the building of St. Peter's and the appointment of a banker for the money received by the preaching of indulgences. Warham and the Bishop of St. David's were appointed Papal commissioners for this purpose.[73] Henry had something to say to this business. He would not allow the Indulgence to be published in England unless he received a commission on the same. In this he was only following the practice of other countries. Negotiations were entered into with the Pope on the matter; and while Leo was willing to allow the king one-fourth of the proceeds, Wolsey stood out for one-third, and successfully. Whether this Indulgence, which was the cause of Luther's protest, would have been entirely devoted to the building of St. Peter's, seems somewhat uncertain. Leo was in pecuniary difficulties. Five days after the issue of the bull to Wolsey the Pope wrote (November 6, 1517) to Warham that he had called Henry's attention on various occasions to the expenses of the Papal See and the debts incurred by his frequent wars. Therefore he hopes that the English clergy will comply with the request shortly to be laid before them for a subsidy to the Holy See.[74] The Pope then announced his intention of sending a Legate to England on the ostensible business of raising funds for an expedition against the Turks and for establishing a five years' truce between Christian princes. This was Wolsey's opportunity. According to English law no Legate could come into the country without the king's consent and express knowledge of the limits of the legation. Henry refused to allow the Legate to enter unless Wolsey was joined with him in the Legateship and, indeed, made first Legate. After much haggling this was agreed to, and on May 17, 1518, Leo X. wrote to Wolsey to announce that Cardinal Campeggio was coming as Legate and that Wolsey was associated with him.[75] Three days after Wolsey's faithful agent, de Giglis, notified that his master was appointed Senior Legate. Campeggio, who had been detained at Calais by Wolsey's orders until the Pope had become amenable to circumstances, arrived in England on July 23, 1518; and Wolsey entered upon his Legateship. In the following month he received from Rome a bull for the visitation of monasteries. We now see the great aim Wolsey had in view when demanding the Legateship; and we can also gather the cause for alarm that existed in the *Curia.*

---

[73] Brewer, II., Part 2, No. 3768.

[74] Ibid, No. 3776.

The Cardinal had gathered up power into his own hands in order to bring about a general reformation of ecclesiastical affairs in the country. He was fully alive to the necessity of the day. The Renaissance had brought in a new spirit. He had seen its effects in Italy, where the supineness of churchmen had allowed it to drift into a semi-paganism. The Church, to do its work, had to rise to a consciousness of the times. The torrent of New Life then rolling through men's intellects was too mighty a force to be dammed. But a wary and skilful hand might turn it to the good of religion instead of allowing it to sap the foundations of Faith and morality. In order to do so, it was necessary to raise the priesthood up to the level of the needs of the time and to renew the spirit of their holy calling. Such and no less was the Cardinal's grand object and one which he planned and worked for, and in great measure, effected in spite of the obstacles met with from quarters which should have rather helped on such noble attempts. To do such work properly required time and a slow process. It was largely an educational measure, both for old and young, and such is not the work of a day nor of a year. The first obstacle Wolsey had was the knowledge that at any moment his power might be snapped by the withdrawal of his legatine faculties. We find him, therefore (March 25, 1519), writing to his agent in Rome, asking that, when Campeggio leaves, he may retain the Legateship with increased faculties, not for extorting money, but for effecting reforms among the clergy.[76] But Leo was in no humor to do this. He would not be disturbed with such business during holiday time, and put off the matter of the reforming of the clergy on the plea that it would supersede the authority of the Bishops. Moreover, he said, Rome (and this was the real point) had not received an equivalent for doing such an extraordinary thing. The Pope was sore that he had not yet received the oft-promised subsidy.[77] At last, however, Leo was forced into granting the extension of the legatine authority for three years. In writing to thank him, the king says (January 20, 1520) that he was sorry it was not for an indefinite period as it would have enabled the Cardinal to prosecute with greater vigor the reformation of the clergy.[78] The Legateship was continued to Wolsey for varying periods by both Leo X. and Hadrian VI., and was subsequently confirmed for life by Clement VII.

---

[75] Rymer, XIII., 606.

[76] Martene: "Mon. Ampl., II. 1285.

It is in the role of an Ecclesiastical Reformer that Wolsey owes his right to the title of a Great Churchman, and this aspect of his character has been strangely neglected by historians or only attended to in the most casual way. What Wolsey planned and what he executed would have certainly, as far as one can judge, saved England from the defection in Faith had not that fatal Divorce, with all its side issues, intervened. Mr. Dixon, in his "History of the Church of England," remarks: "A clerical Reformation, a reformation without meddling with the Catholic faith, had been attempted already by the best sort of the clergy throughout Europe. Three great Councils had been held to bring it about within the last hundred years, and to each of these Councils England had sent representatives. The defeat of this attempted reformation by Councils, which was effected by the intrigues of Rome and above all by the skill of the last of the great Popes, Martin V., is the most mournful event of modern history. It caused despair; it gave weight to the clamors that no reformation was to be expected from the Church herself; and thus it opened the way for the invasion of the temporal power and for the doctrinal revolution which presently overswept Europe."[79] How Wolsey's proposal of effecting a reformation of discipline was regarded by such prelates as Fox, of Winchester, can be gathered from the following beautiful letter[80] in reply to an official notice of a legatine measure:

"Great was the contentment and joy, most reverend father, which I received from your recent letter, which told me that your Grace is set upon reforming the whole body of the clergy, and that you had notified and fixed a day on which the work shall be begun and proceeded with. This day I have truly no less longed for than did Simeon in the Gospel desire to see the Messias waited for by all men. And on reading this letter of your Grace's, I persuade myself and have in a manner a clear setting forth of a more entire and whole Reformation of the Ecclesiastical hierarchy of the English people than I could expect or even hope to see brought about or even so much as attempted in this age. As in duty bound, I indeed did strive to carry out that same design within the limits of my own small jurisdiction which your Grace will soon bring about in the two provinces of this kingdom. For the space of three years this great affair was the object of my studies, labors, watchings and travail, till I discerned, what I have not before thought of, that all things pertaining to the primitive integrity of the clergy, and especially to the monastic state, were perverted either by dispensations or corruptions, or else became obsolete and depraved by the iniquity of the times and being antiquated. As this, in a declining life, increased my will and desire, so it took from me all hopes of ever seeing a renewal even in my own diocese. But I do now gather from your Grace's most welcome letter an assured hope and full expectation of seeing a reformation both entire and public. For I am fully persuaded by many instances that whatsoever your Grace at any time may design or undertake, as it will be wisely concerted, so with prudence and resolution you will accomplish it without difficulty or delay. For so surprising is your skill of things both Divine and human, so extraordinary is your favor and authority with our Sovereign Lord the King and His Holiness the Pope, an advantage your Grace has in such a manner improved, that you have gained the highest renown in the whole world; and certainly an account of your most illustrious Legateship—by your sole conduct you have composed the differences and settled peace among Christian princes, and now you have determined to employ it in reforming and settling the ecclesiastical state and discipline. By this you will deserve solid and undying honor from God and from all posterity, and will be distinguished by a name so far beyond that of any other who in memory of man hath been sent here as Legate from the Pope, as Peace is more to be desired than War and the Clergy ought to be more holy and reverend than the Layfolk.

---

[77] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. IV.. 3. [78] Martene: "Mon Ampli," III., 1304. [79] *Op. cit.*, I., pp. 23-24. [80] The original is in Latin.

"For if, while the names of several other Legates are forgotten, these two whose decrees were only drawn up and left imperfect by their early return to Rome, are still justly celebrated and esteemed by all men, what Time or Envy will be able to erase or dim the lustre and fame of your Grace's name, when you shall restore to dignity and integrity the whole clergy and religious of England, and enact laws for their preservation and lasting establishment?—laws which you shall cause to be confirmed and recommended by being carefully and conscientiously observed.

"I doubt not but that your Grace will with less difficulty and greater success carry out this business, since our most Christian king, by whose exhortations, encouragement and advice (as I think) you have undertaken this task, will even lend his authority and aid to your godly desires; and the prelates, especially the Bishops, will heartily concur by their best endeavors; and as I judge by myself and so far as my own mind suggests, this Reformation of the clergy and of religious persons will so abate the calumnies of the laity, so advance the honor of the clergy and so reconcile our Sovereign Lord the King and nobility to them and be so much more acceptable to God than all the sacrifices we can offer, that I intend to devote to its furtherance the short course of my life I have now to run, as I shall more openly declare to your face on the day fixed by your letters, if it be granted to me to see it, living and well. Meanwhile, whilst I live I shall daily and constantly in my Mass pray our good God to keep your Grace and to further all your projects both happily and prosperously."[81]

This letter of the aged Bishop shows the high hopes that Wolsey's Legateship inspired in those who had the true interests of the Church at heart. "In their eyes it appeared to be a supreme effort to carry the clerical reformation. The extraordinary power of a Legate exercised by an Englishman and always limited by the supreme power of the Crown, was not repulsive to the nation."[82]

From Wolsey much was expected, and as far as we can gather from what he did, his scheme of Reformation seems to have been laid on the following lines. He proposed: (1) To hold a general visitation of the monasteries and of the whole clerical body by an authority which could not be resisted. The purpose of this visitation was to restore sound discipline and morals and to enforce the due performance of the duties of each state. (2) To provide the means for higher education for the clergy, both in the colleges and universities. (3) To found new bishoprics in the larger towns. (4) To guard the nation against the poisoning New Learning in religion by strengthening their faith and by the solid work of education.

This was the great work he tried to do in England and which he aspired to do for the world at large by means of the Papacy. If in that evil hour of the Church's need the cool, far-seeing Wolsey had sat in St. Peter's chair and ruthlessly set his knife to cut away abuses, might not the religious history of Europe have been a brighter page instead of a harrowing and disheartening remembrance?

We must now proceed to investigate Wolsey's work of Reformation, and for convenience sake we will follow the above plan.

---

[81] Fiddes: "Collections," p. 85.

[82] Dixon, *Op. cit.*, I., p. 28.

I.—THE VISITATION OF RELIGIOUS AND OF THE CLERGY.

To touch the clergy and religious and to speak of Reform in connection with these bodies is always an invidious task; for Protestantism has had such an effect that the word Reformation at once connotes immorality; whereas such a conclusion is unwarranted by any impartial view of the whole case. Clergy and religious may stand in need of a reformation, and yet have nothing, or but little, against them on the score of morals. It may also very easily happen that highly organized bodies, jealous of privileges granted in the course of centuries, are content, perhaps too content, to enjoy these privileges to the letter and to allow the spirit to take care of itself. All such bodies are in danger of an excess of conservatism; and the closer the bond which binds the members to each other the more do they suffer from the abuse of the *ésprit de corps*. To bring them up to the needs of the present requires a strong hand and a firm one; and he who sets his hand to the work is sure to be unpopular with those whose repose he has troubled. That such should be the case both with clergy and religious is no wonder. If the clerical state, *in se*, is of Divine institution, the same cannot be said of the religious state; and of neither can it be predicated as regards their artificial methods of organization. They therefore come under the universal law of Decay, and hence the necessity, from time to time, of Reformation.

Our first attention must be directed to the religious bodies. We find two great divisions. The first was the English Benedictines, who by a thousand years had become native to the soil, and as a body managed their own affairs. They had outside England no superior, save the Pope, the Abbot of Abbots. This is the normal Benedictine constitution; and any attempts at interfering with it have always been made at the cost of efficiency. Then there was the large body of friars of various colors—black, gray, white and parti-colored, with Cistercians, Carthusians, Cluniacs, Gilbertines and the Black and White Canons, *i. e.*, the Augustinians and Premonstratensians. There were also many other smaller bodies. All these were, as a rule, of thirteenth century introduction and more or less under the jurisdiction of foreign superiors.

Wolsey seems to have had a great belief in the old English order of St. Benedict. And besides being Abbot (1521) *in commendam* (the only known example of this practice in England) of the first monastery, that of St. Albans, he held letters of fraternity in others. The great proof of the reality of his interest was that the Benedictines trusted him and in many cases put into his hands their most cherished and sacred right, the election of Abbots. As Legate he had the rights of visitation over these houses; and he secured also the right of visitation over the few (six at most) which beyond St. Benedict's idea were removed from episcopal jurisdiction.

According to Polydore Vergil,[83] in 1518, that is as soon as he became Legate, he summoned the various religious orders before him and after expressing his good will to them, spoke very plainly of their defects and of the desire he had of seeing them live according to their rules, attending more to education in letters and good deeds. He announced his intention of taking the matter himself in hand, lest their orders should become extinct. In accordance with this warning he seems to have made a surprise visit to the royal monastery of Westminster in that very same year, where, according to the same author (who is, however, never to be trusted either when he praises or dispraises the Cardinal), the monks were treated with considerable rigor. Truth to say, the Westminster monks, perhaps on account of the court, were not a favorable specimen of Benedictine energy. They had been removed, too, from the healthy supervision of their Bishop, and no doubt they needed a stirring up. But we need not take too literally Polydore Vergil's words:

"*De statu monachorum severe cognoscit, intemperanterque omnia agit, miscet, turbat, ut terreat cæteros, ut imperium ostendat, ut se terribiliorem præbeat.*"

On January 20, 1524, Richard Beere, Abbot of Gloucester, died; and, by act of the prior and community, the election of his successor was put into Wolsey's hands. The delegates of the Abbey met in Wolsey's private chapel at York Place[84] on March 3 of the same year, and there met the Cardinal on this business. After mature deliberations and consultations with learned and prudent men, as he said, he elected Brother Richard Whiting, of that same monastery, to be the Abbot thereof. He was a man, said Wolsey, who was provident and discreet, commendable in life, morals and knowledge, circumspect in spiritual and temporal matters, with the knowledge and power of safeguarding the interests of the Abbey.[85] How well the Cardinal judged history tells. When the evil days fell upon Glaston, no fault could be found with the monks of Whiting's house. "They were kept so straight," and the Abbot laid down his life in defense of the rights of his Church and is one of the Blessed Martyrs of the order.

We find other Benedictine houses, such as Gloucester, Peterborough, Aldeney, besides Cistercian and other houses, putting the elections into his hands. And how in the case of the Abbess of Wilton[86] he went directly against the king's desire and the Boleyn influence, and appointed one who would rule discreetly and strictly, is a story that can be seen in the State papers of the period. He also knew how prejudicial to the discipline and welfare of a house old and feeble superiors were. There are many instances of his urging such to resign. Not that his efforts always were successful at once. Richard, Abbot of Hyde (New Minster), was an example. He had been Abbot thirty-eight years when he received a letter from the Cardinal in which, after being complimented upon ordering his house discreetly, he was told that now from old age and imbecility he was unable to attend to it and was therefore urged to resign. While thanking the Cardinal for his commendations, the Abbot assures him that he is not so aged or impotent of body or wit but that he is able to exercise his office to the pleasure of God, increase of good religion and wealth of his house. He has no intention of resigning, and trusts that Wolsey will rather conserve and aid him than "experiment any sharper means" to remove him. He seems to have kept to his office till his death. The Abbot of Peterborough was another case. The Bishop of Lincoln reports (June 14, 1527) to Wolsey that the Abbot will not resign, but says he will keep his office, as he is as able as ever for it, and that he will ride to London town to Wolsey to prove it. Whether he died or was deposed is not clear. The next Abbot was appointed in 1528 by Wolsey, to whom the election was committed by the monks.

---

[83] Cf. Polyd. Verg. "Aug. Hist.," (ed. 1555), p. 657.

[84] Now known as Whitehall.

[85] Hearne: "Adam de Domerham," Vol. I., pp. 97-103.

[86] The nuns at Wilton were obstreperous.

In 1524 Wolsey summoned all the black monks of St. Benedict to a chapter. Former Legates, such as Otho (1236-7), had done so. They did not realize the English Benedictine spirit, and had forgotten the discretion which characterizes the rule and which leaves so much to the decision of the local superiors. These Italian Legates tried to force a discipline, easy enough in Italy, upon a more northern nation. This was especially in the matter of perpetual abstinence from flesh meat. The result was always the same. Benedictines bow to authority; they tried over and over again to undertake the perpetual abstinence and failed, and dispensations had to be obtained from Rome.[87] Wolsey seems to have read the decrees

---

Thomas Bennet, Wolsey's commissary, writes to his master (18th July, 1528) that he has used every effort to bring the nuns over to Wolsey's wishes, but finds them so untoward that three or four of the "captains" had to be put into ward. Only the new abbess-elect and her sisters were compliant. On the same day the abbess writes to the Cardinal that since his coming home she had followed the advice of Bennet and urged her nuns to be more "reclused within the monastery against which they showed many considerations. She hopes in time to order herself according to his pleasure, and to rule her sisters according to their religion, without any such resort as has of late been accustomed." (Brewer, IV., n. 4528-4529). The new abbess-elect, Isabel Jordane, had been prioress and had been reported to Wolsey as being "ancient, wise, and discrete." The question of reform was evidently mainly that of a due observance of the law of enclosure, which results from the Benedictine law of obedience.

[87] On the whole question of eating meat the reader can be referred to the author's "English Black Monks of St. Benedict," Vol. I., p. 16, where it is found that in the days of St. Dunstan the eating of flesh meat was allowed.

of these other Legates and determined to enforce them. He drew up certain constitutions and laid them before the assembled chapter. We can only judge what he proposed by the reply the chapter made to him. After thanking him for his book of statutes and saying that many of his regulations ought to be received by all good monks, they point out that others were too austere for the times, and that as the number of monks and monasteries in England was too great to allow of them being enforced without exciting murmurs, the fathers of the chapter begged the Cardinal so to modify the reformation of their order as not to drive the weak into flight, apostasy or rebellion, nor to keep away those who wished to enter the order. They fear that if the Reformation be conducted with too much austerity there will not be sufficient monks left to inhabit the monasteries.[88] From this interesting document we can gather that the Benedictine chapter was quite willing to be brought up to the level of the needs of the day, if they were not already in that position. This has always been their characteristic. But they had had plenty of experience in the past of the ill effects of a tinkering legislation by those who did not in the least understand their spirit. As far as we know, Wolsey had the wisdom to see this and did not reform them away. But the good effect of his interest in the order is to be seen when the Dissolution came and the black monks stood out conspicuously among the religious men as having their houses thoroughly in order.

In the year 1519 he began the work of reforming the Black Canons of St. Augustine. There were several bodies of Black Canons, and these Wolsey formed into a congregation modeled after the fashion of the English Benedictine Congregation, which, in its turn, is the only one which has followed the Church's legislation as laid down in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council.

Indeed, Wolsey seems to have taken bodily the greater part of his Augustinian Reform from the famous *Bulla Benedictina* of Benedict XII. (1334). He added, however, certain regulations of his own, and one on the regulation of divine service is worth quoting. After saying that the Office was to be said neither too quickly nor too slowly, and that each one was to be present at the services, especially at matins and the principal Mass, the Cardinal enacts: "And with all ecclesiastics, and especially religious, that method of singing is divinely approved which is not intended to gratify the ears of those present by the levity of its rhythm nor to court the approval of worldlings by the multiplicity of its notes. But that which in plain song raises the minds of the singers and the hearts of the hearers to heavenly things." Therefore plain song is to be used, and the use of the *Cantus fractus vel divisus*, called "prick-song," is forbidden except at Our Lady's Mass and such like non-conventual offices at which lay singers are allowed in most religious houses. On Sundays and feast days the canons, if they can do it themselves, may use some simple melodies at Mass and Vespers, provided that all the words be sung and the music express the sense. There were also wise rules, besides those of discipline, which secured the intellectual life of the body and brought them into touch with the national universities.[89]

---

[88] Brewer, Vol. IV., n. 953.

These constitutions were to last till 1521, when the General Chapter of the body would consider and ratify them.

Wolsey, as it was clearly impossible for him to visit in person all the religious houses, delegated his power to various Bishops. For instance, when he was in France, on his way after the famous meeting known as the Field of the Cloth of Gold, he wrote to the Bishop of Salisbury (October 20, 1521) empowering him as his deputy to visit the nunneries of his diocese and proceed against such as were guilty of "misgoverance and slanderous living," and to remove the nuns into other places of the same order as he best and most conveniently can.[90] Many of the smaller houses, especially of women, had become disorganized through want of members; and discipline had necessarily fallen where there were only three or four to keep up an observance which required at least twelve. One of these convents, Bromehall Priory, in which there were only two or three nuns, was dissolved December 5, 1521.

At the beginning of January, 1524, Clement VII., then newly elected, confirmed Wolsey's Legateship and granted it him for life with all faculties, "which was never heard of before."[91] Wolsey when thanking the Pope (February 24, 1524) says it was "an immense addition to his obligations to Clement, and that he will devote every effort to fulfilling the Pope's commands and omit no opportunity of forwarding his interests with the king." The Cardinal promises solemnly that he will execute his office with "as great care for the honor of the Holy See as for his own safety."[92]

Wolsey then turned his attention to the other class of religious, that is to the friars. The Dominicans or Black Friars took the proposed visitation sensibly. Wolsey's agent, Clerk, writes from Rome (July 28, 1525) that they are content to submit their suits to the Pope and sue to Wolsey. The general of that order, a very wise, learned and virtuous man, was about to communicate with Wolsey on the matter, and Clerk advises the Cardinal to "deal somewhat better with them as they take their way."[93] The White Friars or Carmelites also submitted. But the Gray Friars, or Franciscans, were not so minded. Even before Wolsey, in accordance with his faculties, announced his intention of holding a visitation of the Gray Friars there seems to have been a great outcry. The Pope himself was in fear. He remembered the rebellion of the Friars Minor against John XXII., and that their dispute went from theology to secular politics. He wrote (July 7, 1524) to Wolsey that the Order of Friars Minor Observants seems to suspect that he was about to visit and reform them. While Clement is sure that Wolsey will act with wisdom, he begs him not to attempt anything on account of the magnitude of the order and the estimation in which it is held throughout the world; for though good may be done in England, it would occasion disturbances elsewhere. The Pope reminds him that the friars could not have obtained their present position without God's blessing and their own good works, and he is to remember that in these troublesome times their good will and the opinion of others about them can do a great deal. They might indeed bear Wolsey's visitation quietly, but they would fear that the same thing would be attempted elsewhere, which they could not stand, as they have rules and superiors of their own. He therefore asks Wolsey to think of the good of Christendom rather than that of England and to make use of gentleness and tact rather than severity in admonishing them.[94] The real motive of this letter will be seen a little later on.

---

[89] Wilkin's "Concilia," IV., pp. 683-88

[90] Fiddes, p. 224.

[91] Clerk to Wolsey, 9th January, 1524. Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VI., 17.

[92] Add. MS., 15, 387 f. 101.

The Cardinal Protector of the order also writes the same day to beg Wolsey to give up the visitation on the ground that while they have no personal feeling against him they are afraid of creating a precedent.[95] What Clement did not put in his letter he, however, did not hesitate to say to Wolsey's agent, Clerk, and bade him write to Wolsey (August 31, 1524) and tell him "for God's sake to use mercy with those friars, saying that they be as desperate beasts, past shame that can loose nothing by clamor."[96]

Wolsey, however, was not the man to be frightened away from what he considered the good of religion. He promised the Pope that he would use his legatine authority with such moderation that no complaint should arise.[97] But still the friars troubled, and advantage was taken by their General Chapter held in July, 1525, at Rome to urge the Pope to exempt them altogether from Wolsey's control. Again, by Clement's order, Clerk writes to his master in the Pope's name "to deal moderately with them, for they are clamorous, importunate, bold and passed shame because they have nothing to lose, have great assistance here in court and credit everywhere among the lay folk." Clerk told the Pope that "no lucre, nor glory, nor envy" would move Wolsey to do anything against them, for they were poor, evil and few and of little estimation compared to other religious in England. Clement said he knew this right well and had put the matter off until the General came to Rome. Clerk hereupon said that it concerned Wolsey's honor that the Pope should not too easily credit their vain and untrue complaints. The Pope, of course, had to listen to both sides; but he promised that all he should do would perhaps be to write some *breve* to Wolsey to exhort him to be kind to the friars, but that there should be nothing derogatory to the Legate, whose honor he would rather increase than decrease.[98] The friars so far gained the day as to secure a two years' restraint upon Wolsey's power, but their triumph was of short duration: within a few weeks it was withdrawn. A matter which has never yet received attention seems to be one connected with this visitation of the Friars Minor. Their General was the famous Quigñones, afterwards Cardinal. He was also Charles V.'s agent in the matter of the Divorce.

---

[93] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VII., 178.

[94] Brewer, IV., part 1, n. 477.

[95] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VI., 96.

[96] Ibid, n. 180.

[97] Theiner, p. 544.

As Wolsey stood or fell with the success or failure of Henry's case and as the Franciscans were strenuous opponents of the Divorce, one is tempted, knowing how many things influence the mind of man and how rare simple intentions are, to ask whether the attitude the Friars Minor adopted may not have had something in it of a personal revenge on the great Cardinal who brought them under the power of his visitation. We shall better be able to judge this when we know exactly what was the Cardinal's attitude in the matter of the Divorce.

As regards Wolsey's project of reforming the clergy, we have already seen the way in which such prelates as Fox regarded it, and it is not saying more than the facts of case warrant when Mr. Blunt, in his "Reformation of the Church of England," says: "It may reasonably be thought that if the Reformation had been fully developed under Wolsey's continued guidance many of the miserable divisions which ensued would have been avoided by his astute statesmanship and the barbarities of each side checked by his humane policy."[99]

The provincial constitutions he issued for the Province of York in 1518 (1515?), while showing that he did not neglect his own diocese or province, are models for ecclesiastical government. Wisely he mainly contents himself with reinforcing the salutary enactments of his predecessors and draws them up into one body of constitutions. The greatest care is taken that the people are properly instructed in the essentials of their religion, and it is worthy of remark that the course of instruction laid down is supremely solid and to the purpose. Four times in the year every priest with cure of souls had to explain to the people "in the vulgar tongue, and without any subtility or fantastic turning about of words," the fourteen articles of faith,[100] the ten commandments of the Law, the two Evangelical precepts of charity, the seven works of mercy, the seven capital sins, the seven opposing virtues and the seven sacraments of Grace. Residence was enforced on all clerics with loss of income unless they had Papal dispensation or were absent with the Bishop's leave for purposes of study, or otherwise engaged in his service. Special arrangements were made for securing the sanctity of the houses of God which are to be kept as places for prayer and for humbly asking forgiveness of sins. As regards the private lives of the clergy, the Cardinal renews the enactments of Archbishop Greenfield prohibiting them from attending unlawful spectacles, especially from duels, tournaments and other sport in which blood might be shed; and as the life of priests should be distinguished from that of lay folk so ought they to be in dress and deportment. On the question of morality, excommunication and the power of the secular arm are threatened. The whole document is published in Wilkins' "Concilia," and is worthy of study.[101]

---

[98] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VII., 178.

[99] Vol. I., p. 43.

This Provincial Constitution will show upon what lines Wolsey desired to proceed as Legate of the whole of England. No sooner did he receive this office than he set about preparing for the general reform. His measures had stirred up the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon his suffragans to Lambeth to keep a general council for "the reformation of enormities." Warham seems to have based his action on some advice of the king's. As the right of holding councils now appertained to the Legate, whose jurisdiction in England was universal, it was necessary formally and at once to vindicate his position. Wolsey, therefore, wrote a dignified remonstrance to Warham saying that he was assured the king will not have him (the Cardinal) so little esteemed as Legate that "you should enterprise the said reformation to the express derogation of the said dignity of the See Apostolic and otherwise than the law will suffer you without mine advice, consent and knowledge, nor ye had no such commandment of His Grace, but expressly to the contrary; and that will appear where His Grace and Highness willed you to repair to me at Greenwich sitting in administration of divines in the quire." He therefore summoned the Archbishop to explain his disobedience to the king's commands, and courteously

---

Seven as regards the Blessed Trinity and seven as regards the Sacred Humanity. [101] See Vol. IV., p. 662.

proposes that they should meet at Richmond, "which shall not be much incommodious" to the old Archbishop.[102] This letter is undated, but it was probably in the midsummer, for Wolsey had summoned a Legatine Synod to meet at Westminster on September 8, 1518; but on account of the "sweating plague," which was then raging, it was prorogued first to December 8 and then to the first Monday in Lent, 1519. The decrees or acts of this synod have not yet been discovered. It was probably a preliminary meeting, as we know that Wolsey had not yet obtained from the Pope a free hand for his proposed reform. It was at this period when he was asking for increased faculties that he was met with the significant reminder that Rome had not received an equivalent for doing so extraordinary a thing as to supersede local authority in the reformation of the clergy.[103] Warham, urged on by those who represented Wolsey as his adversary and "the great Tyrant," took advantage of the delay in the arrival of the Legate's full powers to cause the official of the Province of Canterbury in the Diocese of Worcester to propose to visit the monks of that Cathedral Monastery. They refused to admit his visitation, as the duty belonged to Wolsey, and were excommunicated by the official in return.[104] But extended powers came in 1523 from Hadrian VI., who is reported to have had more confidence in Wolsey than in all the other prelates in the world. He also expressed a great wish to see the Cardinal and to confer with him about the state of Christendom.[105]

Strype, quoting from York Registers, says that in 1523 Wolsey summoned the clergy of both provinces to treat of reformation. They were to come before him at Westminster. Like a wise prelate he desired to take the clergy themselves into his confidence and to secure their coöperation. We know at this time Warham had summoned the Convocation of Canterbury to meet at St. Paul's. There was a grant to the king to be levied. Wolsey ordered them to attend his Legatine Assembly instead, and issued a special summons to this effect. What was done there in the way of Reformation we do not know. But evidently Wolsey disturbed by his vigor the calm and serenity of some of the clergy. It was probably a cleric who wrote (May 14, 1523) that the Cardinal on the first day of Convocation when Mass was finished at St. Paul's cited the clergy to appear before him at Westminster. There was another Mass, and within six or seven days the priests proved that the Convocation was void because they were summoned to appear before My Lord of Canterbury. Wolsey, therefore, sent out new citations for eight days after the Ascension: "and then I think they should have the third Mass of the Holy Ghost. I pray God the

---

[102] Wilkins, IV., p. 660. [103] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. IV., n. 3. [104] Ibid, n. 131. [106] Ibid, n. 169.

Holy Ghost be among them and us both." "I do tremble," says he, "to remember the end of all these high and new enterprises. For oftimes it hath been that to a new enterprise there followeth a new manner and strange sequel. God of His mercy send His Grace into such fashion that it may be for the best."[106]

We shall see better in the course of this study what it was that Wolsey did, and so we can make up for the loss of the acts of his synods and convocation. He seems to have urged the Bishops to revise their Cathedral statutes and to have them confirmed by his authority. In 1526 the statutes of Lichfield Cathedral were revised and submitted to him by the Bishop and Chapter. He held a visitation of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1518, when he made salutary decrees to free the chapter from the heavy burthen of debt then weighing upon it.[107] From a letter of the Bishop of Ely (December 28, 1520) we can see that he ordered the prelates to attend at their cathedrals at the times for holding ordinations, and in his own Diocese of York ordinations were duly held. He received from the Pope (May 12, 1528) special faculties to degrade unworthy clerics.[108] He set about a reformation of the spiritual courts, making strenuous efforts to put the provincial courts, the Courts of Arches and Audience, upon proper and new footings and tried to introduce an altogether simpler form of legal procedure.[109]

The consideration of the reform of the clergy leads us to the subject of the way in which he sought to bring it about. And this was mainly by the process of intellectual development.

II.—THE FOUNDING OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

There are two ways of bringing about a reform where it is needed, and they can be summed up in two words—"Don't" and "Do." It is easy enough to issue prohibitory laws, and it is just as easy to evade them. This Wolsey seems to have realized, and one notices the absence of such decrees in all his work. He wanted to build upon a more reasonable and lasting foundation to teach men to know and then to work. He felt that it was ignorance that was at the root of most of the mischief of the day. Educate men, and they will know better. This accounts for the treatment he often meted out to those who were brought before his Legatine Court accused of heresy. For instance, when Tavener, organist of St. Frideswide's, at Oxford, was brought before him on that charge, Wolsey set him free, excusing the man and saying he was "only a musician."[110]

---

[106] Cotton MS., Titus, B. I., 112. [107] Dugdale: "History of St. Paul," Appendix, p. 53. [108] Rymer, XIV., 239. [109] Dixon, p. 17. [110] A. Wood, "Althene," I., 338.

In the educational foundations which cover the Cardinal's name with undying fame, it must be distinctly remembered that they were for the education of the clergy. His own words were that they were for scholars "to be brought up in virtue and qualified for the sacerdotal dignity."[111] It was part of his reform to secure for England a priesthood that should be in the front rank of learning and whose lips should guard wisdom.

In the beginning of 1518 the Cardinal attended Queen Katherine on a visit to the University of Oxford. He was already held there in the highest estimation and seems always to have kept up the friendliest relations with his old college,[112] and since June, 1515, the University had decreed that every one preaching before it should pray publicly for the good estate of the Archbishop of York, and after his death for his soul among the dead.[113] After assisting at an entertainment at Magdalen College he went to the Convocation House, where he harangued the University and professed his willingness to serve it in all noble offices. They trusted him. He began his plans for colleges at least as early as April, 1518, and in June the University by a solemn decree of convocation surrendered all their privileges and statutes, except those of the colleges, to be by him disposed and reframed. Whether he ever did have time to reform the University statutes so as to do away with a great deal of worn out and antiquated machinery is not certain; but he founded seven lectureships, viz.: Theology, Civil Law, Physics,[114] Philosophy, Mathematics, Greek, together with Rhetoric and Humanities. The readers he appointed were all men of the first ability: Thomas Brinknell, reader in Divinity, wrote against Luther in the name of the University; Ludovicus Vives read in Law and Humanity, Thomas Musgrave in Physics, Richard Catelin in Mathematics, Calphurnius in Greek, with Clement and Lupset.

One of Wolsey's plans was to found at Oxford a great college to be called "The College of Secular Priests," conceived on the largest scale and to hold more than five hundred students, all of whom would be future priests. And as a feeder for this, as Eton was to King's and Winchester to New College, he determined to found a large school likewise. His birthplace, Ipswich, was to be the seat of this home of learning. But such grand and important schemes, regulated with all that magnificence and detail which the Cardinal knew how to value as an attraction, was a most costly undertaking.

---

[111] Brewer, IV., 5212. [112] In 1507 the Fellows had a present of venison from him (Bloxam, 28), and again in 1520. [113] Bloxam, p. 24. [114] Wolsey also was the chief promoter of the establishment of the College of Physicians in 1518. "To check the boldness of those men who prefer physic more out of avarice than any confidence of a safe conscience, to the great damage of the ignorant and credulous people." See Goodall's "Royal College of Physicians" (ed. 1684), p.6.

Its object was for the benefit of the Church to provide a higher education for the clergy. It was, therefore, but right and proper that the Church should supply the greater part of the means. And it was in carrying out this that Wolsey has reaped undeserved obloquy.[115] Looking round England, he saw that many of the religious houses were suffering from the dire effects of the Black Death. The number of the communities had decreased and those who remained were often crippled by debt. It was an open question whether such houses, in spite of old associations and local interests, were of any real benefit to religion at large, and whether, as the inmates could not or did not fulfil the conditions under which they received their benefactions, a use could not be found for the goods to the greater benefit of the Church. Also with the greater "solemn monasteries" a like question arose. Did they expend sufficient of their wealth in the wider interests of the Church, or did they look to home too much? The way that Wolsey acted shows the solution he gave to the problem. He procured bulls from the Pope[116] to dissolve such smaller houses as were reduced to the number of six inmates. The rights of the existing members were not neglected, and provision was made for their support. Their property was made use of for the College at Oxford and the School at Ipswich. Likewise with the abbeys, Wolsey, by course of visitations and other influences, made them know that they would have to exert themselves for the general welfare of the Church in England, and that they were bound to work for the common good of the country. However, we find the abbots and other religious persons propitiating the great Cardinal with presents of money and plate for his foundations. Undoubtedly it often happened that the agents Wolsey employed in this affair acted harshly and without due consideration for those they were dispossessing. Wolsey had to bear the blame, and his enemies were quite ready to seize upon the slightest occasion of damaging his reputation with the king. Henry, who had written (October 10, 1524) to thank Clement VII. both for the extension of Wolsey's legatine authority and for the faculties granted him for suppressing certain monasteries on behalf of the new college,[117] now on the adverse reports causes the Cardinal to be informed of these by Sir Thomas More.

---

[115] As an example of the hatred and calumny the Cardinal incurred by touching the monasteries we may take what Warham says in a letter he wrote (14 July, 1526) to Wolsey, saying that when he was last in Canterbury a white monk (*Cistercian*) of Sutton reported that Wolsey had suppressed that house and expelled the religious, taking away their lands and goods, so that they were obliged to beg or use some craft. He offered to sew at a tailor's and other occupations. Warham examined him and the other White Monk confessed that he had spread the report and that it was untrue. (Brewer, Vol. IV.) [116] Ghinucci wrote to Wolsey (21 August, 1526) that the Pope was much interested in the details of Wolsey's College and feels sure that the Cardinal will not omit Greek literature, though there was no mention of it in the account Wolsey sent of his plan. The Pope requests that there may be at least two Greek lectures established in the New College. (Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VIII., 113.)

Wolsey promptly wrote to the king (February 5, 1525) "touching certain misorders supposed to be used by Dr. Allen and other my officers in the suppression of certain exile and small monasteries wherein neither God is served nor religion kept. These, with your gracious aid and assistance, converting the same to a far better use, I propose to annex unto your intended College of Oxford." He then tells the king that though "some folk which be always more prone to speak evil may have informed the king otherwise, I have meant, intended, or gone about, nor also have willed mine officers to do anything concerning the said suppression, but under such form and manner as is, and hath largely been, to the full satisfaction, recompense and joyous contentation of any person which hath had or could pretend to have, right or interest in the same;" and he concludes by saying he would be wrong to acquire anything *ex rapinis* in the foundation of his colleges which were intended for the king's honour, the advancement of learning and the weal of his own soul."[118]

In a letter of Henry's to Wolsey (July 14, 1528) about the election of the Abbess of Wilton,[119] after saying: "I understand which is greatly to my comfort that you have ordered yourself to Godward as religiously and virtuously as any prelate or father in Christ's Church can do. Wherein so doing and persevering there can be nothing more acceptable to God, more honour to myself nor more desired of your friends, amongst whom I reckon not myself the least," he then refers again that many "mumble it abroad" that the goods for building the colleges "are not best acquired and come from many religious houses unlawfully the cloak of kindness towards the edifying of your college."[120]

Wolsey replied (July 15, 1528): "I humbly thank you for your great zeal in desiring the purity of my conscience and that nothing should be done by me in the matter of my college or otherwise which should give occasion to others to speak ill of me. I have received from many old friends and exempt religious persons various sums of money, but not so much as is reported; nor has any been corruptly given, as I shall be ready to prove to Your Grace. But to avoid all occasion for the future I promise Your Majesty that if I should be compelled to sell all that I have, neither I nor any other by my consent, shall take anything for the use of my college, however frankly offered, from any religious person; purposing so to order my poor life that it shall appear that I love and dread God and also Your Majesty."[121]

---

[117] Add. MS., 15,387, f. 123.

[118] Harleian MS., 7035, f. 174.

[119] As regards Anne Boleyn's nominee, her sister-in-law, Henry writes to her and says that Wolsey had examined her and that she had confessed to immorality. "Wherefore I would not for all the gold in the world cloake your conscience nor mine to make her a ruler of a house which is of so ungodly demeanour; nor I trust that you will not that neither for brother or sister I should so distain mine honour or conscience:" (Brewer, IV., 4477.)

[120] Fiddes, p. 174.

His colleges were started. That at Oxford, which was to be known as the College of Secular Priests, had its name changed by the king to *Cardinal's College;* but on the fall of Wolsey the college, with all its rich and sumptuous furniture, was seized by the king; and, perhaps in answer to Wolsey's piteous appeals "for his poor college," the institution was reformed on a much smaller scale and Henry took to himself all the credit of the foundation, changing the name to King's College, which is now known as Christ Church. The school at Ipswich was entirely destroyed and was never refounded. All that remains of Wolsey's munificence is the gateway. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*[122] The noble plans for building up a learned and prudent clergy, which had been Wolsey's aim, came to naught through no fault of his. But Oxford still cherishes the great Cardinal as one of her most illustrious sons and, as Convocation wrote to him, "not so much as a founder of a college, but of the University itself."[123]

III.—TO FOUND NEW BISHOPRICS IN THE LARGER TOWNS.

Wolsey knew that in the immediate action of the episcopate lies the strength of the Church. He would have had but little sympathy with those who try to exalt the Papacy at the cost of the episcopacy. He felt, doubtless, as Nicholas V. said, that the Roman Pontiffs had "stretched out their arms too far," and had "left scarcely any power to the other Bishops," and that he "hoped the better to uphold his own jurisdiction by not assuming that which was foreign to him."[124] We shall have to deal later on with Wolsey's attitude to the Holy See; and shall show that his conduct was always that befitting his high dignities and offices of Archbishop, of Cardinal and of Legate. But here we must examine his work of reform and compare what existed in his day with his magnificent and statesmanlike plan.

For hundreds of years England had been divided into two historic provinces, and the names of Canterbury and York are dear today. Canterbury, with its primatial Benedictine chapter, numbered among her suffragan churches Rochester (Benedictine), Winchester (Benedictine), Norwich (Benedictine), Worcester (Benedictine), Ely (Benedictine), Bath and Wells (a double chapter, Benedictine and secular), Coventry (also a double chapter), London (secular), Chichester (secular), Exeter (secular), Sarum (secular), Hereford (secular), Lincoln (secular) and four small Welsh dioceses. In all sixteen, out of which six had purely Benedictine chapters, two had a double and ten (including the four important Welsh dioceses) had secular canons.[125] The province of York was much smaller in number. Besides the Metropolitan Church of York (secular) there were only the Benedictine Cathedral of Durham and the Augustinian Cathedral of Carlisle.

---

[121] Brewer, IV., 4513.

[122] Ever witness for him,
Ipswich and Oxford! one of which fell with him,
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it;
The other, though unfinish'd, yet so famous,
So excellent in art, and yet so rising,
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue.
"*Henry VIII.*," *act iv., s. 2.*

[123] Wood, "Annales," II., 27.

[124] Pastor, Vol. II., p. 30 (English ed.)

Wolsey's plan was taken from existing examples. He mapped out the country, and where there was a great abbey and a large town there he determined to set up a bishopric. It is more than probable that Henry VIII. followed the plan drawn up with his consent by Wolsey when he made a part restitution of his ill-gotten goods after the dissolution of the monasteries. Thirteen new sees were arranged for, though only six, viz.: Westminster,[126] Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol and Peterborough, were actually founded. And within recent years, when the authorities of the Anglican Church were increasing the number of bishoprics, they followed out the plan traced by Wolsey. But he never saw it realized. The difficulties he had to contend against in this necessary work of reform may be seen by the following extracts from the State papers:

From Casale to Vannes. (October 30, 1528.) [Rome.]

The erection of the Cathedrals was proposed in the Consistory, and all seemed ready to consent to the king's desire; but as it is a matter of the greatest importance it should be granted with greater authority than could be done then. The matter was therefore referred to the Legates (Wolsey and Campeggio), and then for them to report to the Pope.[127] This was, of course, to gain time. The matter having already been settled in England, and all that was asked was for the Pope's authority, the next step the *Curia* took was to issue (November 12, 1528) a bull empowering Wolsey to do what he had already done.[128] Perhaps from a letter of Casale to Wolsey (December 17, 1528) one may see what was at work. Wolsey had been lately appointed to Winchester. Casale says: "The Cardinals are very much offended seeing how much they have lately suffered at the remission of fees required by the Cardinal for the expedition of Winchester bulls."[129] On January 28, 1529, Gregorio Casale writes to Vincent Casale that: "Many of the Cardinals are contented that everything should be done in England and the Bishops elected there; but that the biretum and the rochet should be conferred from Rome. Cardinal de Monte showed him an article which he had found, of a previous license to create Bishops in England."[130] Evidently from this, as we see in his arrangements for Ireland, Wolsey wanted to do away with the pernicious system of Papal Provisions, which was the result of the Avignon System of Finance and was also against the law of the land. He was probably going to act as Francis, by his concordat with Leo X. had secured for France, or to revert to the older English way of capitular election. Formerly it was only the election of an Archbishop that required to have Papal confirmation; and, as Papal representative, the metropolitan had the right of confirming the capitular election of Bishops without resorting to Rome. Pope Honorius I. in 634 gave to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York the right of conferring the pall upon new Archbishops without recourse to Rome.[131] It was when the *Curia* found the expediting of bulls a profitable office, and that *annates* were not only worth having, but could be got, that the old system was done away with and the Pope himself "provided" the Bishops.

---

[125] The system of monastic chapters which was once so marked a feature in the pre-Reformation days is almost peculiar to England and is a mark of the debt which the country owes to the Black Monks of St. Benedict. [126] Westminster ceased to be a bishopric from the days of Mary Tudor, who restored the church to the Black Monks. Her sister made it a collegiate church and a "peculiar." [127] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B., X., 119. [129] Rymer, XIV., 273.

Casale carries on the account in a letter to Wolsey (January 30, 1529) and says: "The difficulty about the bull for erecting abbeys into Cathedrals arises from this, that most of the Cardinals think it will detract from the honour of the See of Rome if Bishops are created except at Rome or receive their investiture from any one except the Pope." But all were agreed on one thing: the *annates* must be paid.[132] It was not until May 29, 1529, that Clement issued the bull erecting certain abbeys into Cathedral churches,[133] but does not mention the names. It was left to the Legate to decide whether these new Cathedrals were to be served by religious or seculars. But it came too late for Wolsey to make any use of it.[134]

---

[129] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. X., 164. [130] Ibid, 46. [131] Bede: "Ecclesiastical History" (Bk. II., c. 17 and 18.) [132] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. XI., 50. Spain had, however, by this time settled the matter in its own way. [133] Rymer XIV., 291. [134] Nor did Wolsey confine his attention to England only. The Lordship of Ireland shared in his solicitude, and a paper of "Remembrances for Ireland" shows part of his scheme for giving peace to that distracted portion of Henry's dominion. In this paper Wolsey notes that: As the bishops and clergy of the Irishry give most help to the rebels, be it provided that no clerk be promoted to any bishopric there unless he be of English birth or of the English nation and language. The bishoprics are so poor that "no honest and learned man" of England will accept them; for while in England there are but two archbishoprics and nineteen bishoprics, there are in Ireland four archbishoprics and above thirty bishoprics. The Pope should be applied to to unite the sees, so as to make but two archbishoprics and nine or ten bishoprics. Also: That the churches of Ireland be built and repaired, the ministers reformed and that no temporal man have any spiritual benefice, and no provision from Rome be henceforth allowed. And:

We must now consider Wolsey in his capacity of Guardian of the Faith. Some have ventured to look upon him as a favorer of the Reformation in matters of Faith. This is an utterly untenable theory; for the Cardinal was perfectly orthodox in Faith. He was, as we are showing, a great Reformer; but only of abuses. He was seeking to reform the Church from within; and without laying sacrilegious hands upon the Deposit of Faith, he was eager to cleanse the Church from the ill effects of human passions. We have already seen how zealous he was that the people should be instructed in the knowledge of their Religion and how he labored that they should have worthy pastors. It remains now to consider how he guarded them against the teachers of the New Learning, who came from Germany and revived the smouldering embers of an almost expired Lollardy.

How Martin Luther began a legitimate protest against abuses, abuses by-the-bye which for the most part the Council of Trent reformed, and how from protest he went into revolt, it is not necessary here to tell.[135] A letter, however, from Rome to Wolsey throws some little light on the subject. The Bishop of Worcester, Wolsey's agent in Rome in 1520, writes (May 28) that six months ago the writings of Friar Martin arrived. Much of their contents was disapproved of by the theologians of Rome on account of the scandals to which they might give rise; and part they condemned as heretical. After long debates it was decided by the Cardinals to declare Martin a heretic; and the Bishop announced that a bull was in preparation on the subject.[136] The bull was published in Rome July 15, 1520, and Wolsey wrote, as one of the official advisers of the Holy See, to offer his counsel for remedying the evil. He forbade at once the circulation of Luther's writings in England; and for this Leo X. wrote to thank him (March 16, 1521).[137] He wanted, however, to show by a public act that the English king and Church equally condemned the false doctrine. On May 12, 1521, Wolsey held a solemn service, surrounded by the Bishops and Abbots, at St. Paul's, where a sermon was preached at the Cross in

---

That Wolsey as Legate of England and Ireland appoint some bishop there as his substitute (about 1524.) (See Brewer.) From Wolsey's point of view he seems to have had reason for his proposal, for the Archbishop of Dublin wrote (23 February, 1528) to the Cardinal, telling him of the lamentable decay of the land, both in good Christianity and in other things, for lack of good prelates and curates in the Church, and that he would do well to promote good men to bishoprics to be examples, etc. (Ibid, p. 3952.)

[135] The various treatments Luther met with are instructive. After a cultured and good-humored contempt for the barbarian friar, Leo X. anathematized him. Clement VII. is reported to have been willing to make him Cardinal to quiet him, provided he chose to accept the grade. ("Calendar of Venetian State Papers," III., 796.) While the Emperor Charles in 1525, when threatening to bring Clement VII. to his knees by invading Italy, told the Florentine Ambassador: "Some day or other perhaps Martin Luther will become a man of worth." (Ibid, IV., n. 920.) The Reformation in Germany, as in England, was mainly an affair of secular politics.

[136] Brewer, III., n. 847.

[137] Brewer, III., 1197.

the churchyard by Bishop Fisher, of Rochester, against the New Learning in religion; and during the sermon Luther's books were burnt.[138]

The Cardinal issued orders that every one possessed of any of the incriminated writings should deliver them up within two weeks, and he caused the Bishops to punish the refractory with the sentence of excommunication.

But though stern towards heresy and clearly alive to the danger, the great minded Cardinal had no taste for controversy and had pity on the poor wretches who, through ignorance, had become infected. Not one of the many brought before the Legatine Court on the charge of heresy was burnt. And this Christian tolerance on the part of Wolsey is all the more creditable to him when we recall the hideous butcheries which prostituted the name of Religion in the later years of Henry and the reigns of his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth. When Henry VIII. wrote his book against Luther the Cardinal seems to have doubted its use. Pace writes to him (June 24, 1518) that the king "is very glad to have noted Your Grace's letter that his reasons be called inevitable considering Your Grace was sometime his adversary herein and of contrary opinion.[139] When, a few years later, Luther entertained hopes of securing Henry to the side of the Reformation through the Divorce, he wrote a humble letter of apology for his virulent attack on the king's book and says that he had been under the impression that Wolsey, "that monster, the public hate of God and man, that plague of your kingdom," had been the author, and he offers to make a public recantation if the king will signify in which way he wishes it to be done.[140] But it was not then a wise thing to abuse Wolsey. Henry, in reply to Luther, says that the Cardinal is too prudent a man to be moved by Luther's abuse, and that he will be dearer to the king the more he is hated by Luther and those like him. Though he calls the Cardinal "the plague of England," the king would have Luther to know that the country owes him many benefits, not the least being his opposition to heresy.

At that time Lutheranism was, as Jansenism in the following century, a favorite charge to make against opponents. Many of the learned men favored by the Cardinal and introduced into his foundations were so accused by his enemies. But without any real cause. A pleasing note is his attitude towards one who, though afterwards joining the reforming party, remained the sincerest and truest man of the number. Latimer had Wolsey's leave to preach throughout the kingdom; and this proves, as Mr. Dixon remarks, that the great Cardinal considered him not as a Lutheran or heretic, but as one inclined to help forward a constitutional and proper reformation, such as he would have carried out if he had been allowed.[141]

---

[138] See Roscoe: "Leo X.," Vol. II., Appendix 9. [139] Brewer, II., n. 209. [140] "Epist. Lutheri," III., 24. This offer was probably the result of Charles V.'s more favorable attitude to Luther.

Dr. Barnes, who afterwards, in 1541, was burnt at Smithfield, seems to have taken scandal at the magnificence affected by Wolsey and preached a sermon in Cambridge against it. As this savored somewhat of Lollardy, officious persons summoned Barnes before the Cardinal, who good-naturedly reasoned with him and asked him if he thought it good and reasonable that he should lay down the silver pillars and pollaxes and other paraphernalia with which he, as Legate, Cardinal and Chancellor, appeared in public, and whether it would be better to coin them into money for the poor. On receiving an affirmative answer, Barnes tells us that the Cardinal said: "Then how think you were it better for me (being in the honour and dignity that I am) to coin my pillars and pollaxes and to give the money to five or six beggars than to maintain the Commonwealth by them as I do? Do you not reckon (quoth he) the Commonwealth better than five or six beggars?" It opens to us, as Dr. Wordsworth justly remarks, some part of the philosophy upon which the Cardinal defended the fitness of the pomp and state which he maintained.[142] The Cardinal only dismissed him, saying: "Well, you say very well." There was nothing heretical, but only a matter of opinion, and Wolsey was tolerant.

From his death bed at Leicester Abbey, almost his last words were to send to the king a message by "Master Kingston," who was taking him under arrest to the Tower, about the danger of heresy. This had been his dread all during the Divorce; for he knew that the Boleyn faction were inclined to Lutheranism. The dying Cardinal said: "And say furthermore, that I request His Grace in God's name that he have a vigilant eye to depress this new pernicious sect of Lutherans, that it do not increase within his dominions through his negligence, in such a sort as that he shall be fain at length to put harness upon her back to subdue them."[143] And he brought forward many examples of the evils that come to a kingdom in temporal matters through supineness in dealing with false teachers.

One thing remains to be said on this point. While Wolsey had power heresy made no way in England, and as soon as he fell and no longer could guide the English Church then the floodgates were opened. He read a lesson, too, to kings, churchmen and people that false teaching is best put down by true teaching, and that the safety of the Church is not to be found in persecution by fire and sword, but in the blessings of education.

---

[141] Cf. *Op. cit.*, I., p. 118. [142] Cavendish (ed. Singer), p. 47—8 note. [143] Cavendish, p. 321.

We have now drawn out the picture of Wolsey in his rôle of Reformer. To finish our study of the Great Churchman we shall have to see him in his relation to the Papacy, in his attitude in the Divorce, in which he alone (saving Katherine) emerges with clean hands, in his personal piety and, greater still, in the hour of his fall. But these are beyond the limits of the present article, and must be dealt with another time. With them the picture of Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal and Archbishop, will be complete and he will take his rightful position as the greatest Churchman of his times.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

London.

UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL IN THE LATE SPANISH COLONIES.

TOO little attention is bestowed by the press and the teaching class on the periodical literature issued from the Department of Education. People for some inscrutable reason instinctively avoid official documents whenever possible. The air of formality about them, the idea of statistics and departmental data and bloodless recital, make one shrink from their examination. This is a very grave mistake. Matter of the highest importance and utility is not infrequently to be found between rigid and cold-looking official covers.

Before touching specifically on what interests Catholics most in the latest Report from the Commissioner of Education, it is permissible to say a word with regard to the manner in which such voluminous work is done. Each report is a miniature library on pedagogics in itself. The year's progress in education all over the area of civilization is as a rule presented for review. Nor is it a mere cursory glimpse that is afforded. Clear synopsis and ample detail always accompany each separate statement. The early genesis and development of the schoolmaster's science is shown in the cases of countries whose chronicle had not been previously presented. Data are collected in every available field of study. Pedagogic conditions are examined from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. The remotest parts of the Far East, such as Corea and Kamtschatka, are explored in search of information bearing on the progress of letters and ethics. Each year's Report consists of two large volumes containing in all about two thousand five hundred quarto pages of closely printed matter. The gathering, arrangement and proper classification of such an enormous stock of facts and figures and historical review is a colossal task for one year, in any one department. Every State in the Union has its own separate report each year. This in itself would be, one would think, sufficient work for any single bureau. But the rest of the world comes in for an equal share of attention—if not in the one report, at least in seriatim instalments. It may be doubted whether any other government possesses so complete an annual chronicle as this. Its scope and completeness are fully in keeping with the vastness of the country and the daring character of its enterprises in all things, public or private.

Nor is it merely that the bird's-eye view of the mental field here presented is both exhaustive and minute. There is a breadth and a philosophical grasp of the subject revealed in the preliminary review by the Commissioner such as could only be shown by one who not only understands his theme, but is in closest sympathy with the higher aims and ends of study. Only a ripe scholar and profound thinker could offer such a review year by year, going over much the same ground every time and carefully noting the progress made as well as the directions in which further progress is possible and desirable.

One great drawback to the value of Reports claiming to be complete was the regular omission of reference to the work of the Catholic schools. This remarkable omission was lately brought under the notice of the Department by some of the Catholic organs, and the Commissioner immediately set to work to correct the anomaly. In the Report issued last year there appeared an exhaustive statement of the Catholic effort to provide education for children of this faith. In the promptitude with which the omission was rectified and the generous spirit in which the paper was drawn up were shown the enlightening influence of true scholarship and the judicial quality of mind which a position of such high responsibility requires for its proper discharge.

The feature of importance in the Report for 1897-98, so far as Catholic interests are concerned, is a statement of the educational conditions in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, by R. L. Packard. As a vast amount of misconception, based not only on ignorance, but deliberate misrepresentation, has been prevalent in respect to the work of Spain in these widely separated regions, it is useful to have some statement, accepted by authority, on the subject. The statement here presented does not claim to be more than an approximate one on many important points. Its purview embraces many localities concerning which but little specific information can be had. It stretches away into a past period over which the dust of antiquity has too deeply settled to allow things to be seen in their proper light. Any one who has had the ordinary experience of searching a parish register for the entry of a certain birth, or marriage, or death can witness how difficult a thing it is to get at the truth in modern days, when orderly methods are more in vogue in all the concerns of the world's bookkeeping than they used to be before the days of the Social Science Association and the Bertillon system of measurement. When we consider how primitive must have been the methods of the tropical colonies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the wonder must be not that statistical information is not the pink of perfection, but that any useful sort is available at all.

While it is of supreme value to the cause of truth and the verdict of the future that Spain's real work be made known in those distant colonies, at a period when other colonies were being utilized only as penal settlements by nations who rail against Spain as despotic and unprogressive, the more practical immediate is involved in the disposition of our present Government toward the educational claims of the late Spanish possessions. This is the period of transition in those places. The old order has vanished; the social fabric is in the dangerous condition of haphazard reorganization. New people, new language, new ideas are surging in. Sub-tropical languor is disturbed by the feverish haste of a strange civilization which despises the midday siesta and feels a felicitous aptitude in the institution of "quick lunch."

From the most ignoble of motives the policy of Spain and the objects of Spanish conquest and civilization have been deliberately held up, on this continent as well as in England, to popular execration. Enslavement of the conquered people in spirit and in body, it was sought to be shown, was the primary object; the superimposition of ignorance upon barbarism one of the means by which the thraldom was to be established and confirmed; the cultivation of superstition as a substitute for true religion the main desire of a gross, sensual and designing clergy. All these untruths have been dinned into the public ear, without fear of contradiction and without remorse or compunction, by a long series of historians and politicians, either from sordid motives looking to the eventual acquisition of Spain's colonies as the result of a popular clamor against the Spanish system, or else to gratify the rancorous spirit of religious dislike. But the truth is great and difficult to repress or bury away even under mountains of falsehood. Mr. Lummis, in his valuable work, "The Awakening of a Nation," brings forward an overwhelming mass of proof of the nobility of Spanish effort to educate, to uplift and to make free the Indians whom the conquests of Cortez and Pizarro and the other great but unscrupulous adventurers had brought under the yoke of Spain. Beside the Cross in Mexico were planted the university, the industrial school and the printing press, a century before ever either school or university was heard of in the English settlements here. These are hard facts for non-Catholic writers to have to face, and it is not all of them who can write on the subject when they are called upon with the frankness and magnanimity of Mr. Lummis. Mr. Packard, the author of this present paper in the Education Report, is obliged at the outset of his historical introduction to admit the vast difference between the early Spanish explorers and the English ones who followed them to other portions of our continent. "We observe," he says, "the contrast between the Spanish conquistadores, the utterly bold, determined, large-minded adventurers, and the English and Dutch colonists of the next century on the northern seaboard. These latter had little of the conquering spirit about them. They left their native country to better themselves in a quiet way and to trade, and their ideas were principally limited to the unambitious parts they had to play. Their natural leaders stayed at home to attend to the promoting and financiering of the colonial interests instead of leading exploring parties in the wilderness. This contrast crops out in many ways. Governor Winthrop wanders three or four miles away from his companions and passes an anxious night alone in the hut of a friendly Indian. A hundred years before a Spanish monk thought nothing of undertaking an expedition of a thousand miles in a wild country abounding in savages, and the English never undertook any such expedition as Coronado's march."

Mr. Packard is painfully overweighted with the consciousness of the Puritan's shortcomings in the matter of benevolent intentions toward the aborigines, and he endeavors to make the most of the very slender capital their records show in this regard, though not a little at the expense of truth and justice. Here, for instance, is a passage which must have required some nerve to indite: "There was one point of resemblance between the Spaniards of the sixteenth century and the English of the seventeenth. Both felt a responsibility for the lost souls they fancied they had found, and were zealous for the conversion and, incidentally, the education of the Indians."

The evidences of such a sense of duty on the part of the early English settlers have been, as a rule, so carefully concealed as to be almost irrecoverable. It seems that Mr. Packard has either overlooked or forgotten what such historians as Mr. Parkman had to say on the subject, or else is confounding labors of the French missionaries with the efforts of the Puritan settlers to convert bad Indians into good by means of a well-known formula.

Great allowance must be made for a man in the position of Mr. Packard, called upon to make out a case in favor of a system which has little claim upon the respect or gratitude of mankind and whose effects upon the aborigines have been much the same as those of the Egyptian plagues. Neither salvation nor education was the motive of English action in regard to the Indian population, but something that seemed more compatible with the principles of modern political economy. He appears to have been haunted with the consciousness of New England shortcomings all the time he was searching up and examining the proofs of Spain's vast services in the other direction. There was no necessity for referring to New England or the Dutch, so far as the reader can see. The subject was Spain in the Spanish settlements and what Spain's priests and educators and statesmen did therein from the time of their discovery until we laid violent hands upon them. But, like the ghost of Banquo, they will keep on looking in at the feast unbidden, even "with twenty mortal murders on their crowns." To offset their manifest shortcomings it is necessary to say something by way of disparagement on the other side, lest it might feel vain-glorious over the praise which justice had compelled at the outset. Something is due to the spirit of the Pagan Renaissance, injured and depreciated by the bare act of justice rendered a more unselfish source of learning. Thus painfully labors Mr. Packard:

"Wherever the Spaniards went they carried the university with them. No matter how narrow and perverted the education of the monks may have been, there was still in it a reminiscence of the humanities, if in nothing else than the monkish Latin they used, and some of the conquistadores themselves were imbued with letters. Even the private soldier Bernal Diaz was able to write his recollections of the mighty deeds he had witnessed, and he left an account which historians have used as an authoritative document. Like superiority of birth, superior education gave (as it still gives) an intellectual superiority of view, which was due to the European university, whose root fibres, when traced, will be found to penetrate that buried civilization from which all modern civilization has sprung, which once dominated the world with grandeur and magnificence and yet filled it with beauty and taste."

Here the question arises: Was it "the humanities" which brought the monks, with their "narrow and perverted" education, or the monks who brought the humanities? A tree is known by its fruits. If a "broader" system has been at work among the aboriginal as well as the exotic peoples brought under the sway of New England ideas, its tangible results ought to be in evidence, either in the morals, the literature or the institutions of the country or the manners of its inhabitants. The Spaniard brought not only the university with him; the Cross was the first thing he planted on the soil. If the conquistadore was cruel and selfish, the priest was there beside him to stay the hand of murder and rapine and teach mankind who is one's neighbor. This arrangement, in the eyes of political economy and the Pagan Renaissance, may appear "narrow and perverted," but for the Christian and the philanthropist it will serve.

Mr. Packard makes a laudable attempt at impartiality when he comes to review the facts of the beginnings of education in the Spanish colonies. Although he prefaces these by a very long and analytic historical résumé by the eminent authority, Blumentritt, having little apparent relevancy to the special subject of education, he sets out his own synopsis by a glance at the backward condition of education in the leading European countries down to the end of the last century. As a means of helping us to a knowledge of the facts he offers an extract from the diary of President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, A. D. 1794, telling how on that day (July 17) he had had a visit from M. Talleyrand Perigord and M. Beaumez, deputy for Arras. Talleyrand explained to him a scheme he had for public education in France. President Stiles asked what was the proportion of those who could not read in that country. M. Beaumez said he thought twenty millions out of the twenty-five millions of population. Talleyrand corrected this estimate; he thought the proportion was about eighteen millions.

A Cuban gentleman, Aurelio Mitjanes, has written a history of the development of education in that island. By its light we are enabled to gather what the much-anathematized Spanish Government did for the promotion of the liberal arts in the "pearl of the Antilles," and if we contrast it with, say, what the English did in Ireland for the same cause, within the same period, it requires no temerity in assertion to declare that the record of Spain is one of Boreal brilliancy beside that of the nation which this public has been taught to regard as incomparably superior. Mitjanes' history is founded upon two much earlier ones, those, respectively, of Arrete and Bachiller. As early as the year 1522, or nearly a hundred years before the University of Dublin, otherwise known as Trinity College, was founded, a Bull of Pope Adrian VI. established the Scholatria of Santiago de Cuba, for the teaching of Latin; and in 1571 a school was founded in Bayamo out of funds left by a Spanish military gentleman, Captain Francesco de Paradas. At Havana, in 1689, the College of San Ambrosio, with a dozen bursarships for the education of young men for the Church, was established, but was ultimately condemned by the Bishop of Havana, because it did not prove capable—probably for lack of teachers—of carrying out its programme. At the Convent of La Merced also a chair of elocution and literature had been founded by Fr. José Maria Penelvar in 1788, but this, too, failed to realize its object, and was ultimately relinquished.

At a time when the cause of education in Cuba seemed to be in low water, the Jesuits appeared upon the scene and with characteristic energy addressed themselves to the task of recovering lost ground. The municipality of Havana early desired to have the services of the order in the establishing of a college, but the differences between the Jesuits and the resident prelates for a long time prevented the realization of the project. At length, in 1717, a wealthy citizen of Havana, Don Gregorio Diaz Anget, donated forty thousand dollars toward the establishment of a college, and seven years afterwards the institution was opened, under the name of the College of San Ignacio, and with it was incorporated the older foundation of San Ambrosio, which, since 1689, had been carried on under the management of the Jesuit order. But the desire of the Havanese for higher education did not stop here. To obviate the necessity of young men of the wealthier class going to Spain to gain the advantage of a liberal education, the City Council had, as far back as the year 1688, appealed to the home government for a charter for a university. The request was forwarded, with an endorsement by Bishop Valdés; but it was not until the year 1721 that the desire was gratified. In that year there came a letter from Pope Innocent XIII. authorizing the fathers of the Convent of San Juan Latran to found a university. It was not, however, until seven years later that the institution opened its doors; but for some years prior to that time its work was being partially done; the Dominicans had been teaching in the chairs of morals, philosophy and canon law even before there was any money available for the purpose. From the beginning the principal offices in the university were given into the hands of the Dominicans, and this arrangement was the cause of discontent and rivalry down to the year 1842. The first rector was Father Tomás de Linares, and he received his appointment, in 1728, from the King; but all his successors were elected in the constitutional way by the university authorities. Mr. Packard states that the university was never very successful as to results, and only served to enable Spain to boast that she had introduced her civilization into Cuba; but he adds that in Spain itself the university ideal was antiquated, inasmuch as it stuck to the

Aristotelian philosophy, and the philosophical system was the scholastic. We may take his opinion for what it is worth. It has to be demonstrated yet that the Aristotelian system was inferior to the Baconian, which was at that time the gospel of Oxford; and if by the "scholastic philosophy" the writer means the Thomist system, we fear he might find some difficulty in demonstrating a superior one in any of the English or American richly-dowered institutions. He is on more rational ground when he assigns as a reason for the indifferent results of the university in Havana the dearth of competent teachers. Not many of these, it may well be believed, were to be found in Cuba—at least in the early days of the university. A striking instance of the extent to which this dearth prevailed is found in the fact that the chair of mathematics was for a long time vacant at Havana because there was no competent man to fill it. Many attempts to reform the system of the university were made from time to time, but it is said that the Spanish Government usually threw cold water on the proposals. This, of course, is set down as one of the sins of Spain; but we would ask any one who knows, and who is impartial-minded, how many attempts were made in our own time to reform the system of Dublin University and open its doors to the people at large, instead of keeping it as a close borough and a fat prize for the favored Protestant few, and in how many cases these were successful. If we had any means of instituting a fair comparison it is likely enough that the University of Havana might prove to have as good a record for intellectual progress in the island as that of Dublin in Ireland.

Besides the institutions named above, there was founded also in Santiago the Seminary of San Basilio Magno for ecclesiastical students. This was started by the same Bishop Valdés already referred to. Institutions somewhat but not altogether similar in their scope were the college and seminary of San Carlos and San Ambrose, in Havana. These had, in their later period, courses in philosophy, theology, law and mathematics.

A great impetus to education and literature was given in Cuba under the administration of Don Luis de las Casas—a generous and enlightened administrator whose name is still held in high honor in the island. He was the founder of a famous association for the advancement of learning and literature, the Sociedad Económica. His efforts were ably seconded by Archbishop Penalver and several other men of wide reputation in different fields of letters and science. This society was, by royal order, given charge of the educational interests of the whole island. It received great help from the religious orders in the work of founding new schools—particularly of the school of the Beneficenzia and the Ursulines. It found that whatever gratuitous education was being given in places outside Havana was altogether owing to the exertions of the religious orders. The society labored in the field of secondary as well as primary education. In the year 1816 we read that a regular department of education was formed and a grant of $32,000 was made by the home government in aid of primary education. We do not believe that any other European country could be shown to have done so much at that comparatively early period—certainly not England, where grants for educational purposes by the State are things of very recent date. Again, in the year 1818, the Spanish Government ordered that the science of political economy be taught in all the universities, and the Sociedad Económica accordingly established a chair in the San Carlos seminary.

Political disturbances exercised later on a disastrous influence upon education throughout the island. Still the Government from time to time took steps to improve the general condition of education, both primary and secondary, and to place the university courses on a level with those at home. The practical character of the education aimed at elicits the approbation of Mr. Packard.

Regarding primary education in Cuba, as early as the year 1821 it was declared free and general by order of the Spanish Cortes. The decree which made this a law ordered that a public school be established in every town of 100 inhabitants, and that there should be one school for every 500 inhabitants in cities. This antedated the passage of the similar law in France by twelve years. Besides the foregoing, the royal decree of February 23, 1883, made primary education obligatory for all Spaniards. The fathers and guardians or others having charge of children should send them to the public schools from their sixth to their ninth year of age unless they gained the same grade of instruction at home or in some private school. As early as the year 1813 the Spanish Cortes proposed to make reading and writing a condition of citizenship, a measure which excited Jefferson's admiration.

Many things conspired to hinder the spread of popular education in Cuba. The political troubles of the island have been a serious drawback. The natural disposition of the populace was one not less formidable. The lower classes are indolent, and careless about either work or education. They do not see life as people in the United States see it. The system of large plantations, where children were widely scattered and where large numbers of them were found useful to their parents in field work, was particularly unfavorable to the spread of education. Then, again, the chronic impecuniosity of Spain proved a terrible stumbling-block. For months and sometimes years there was a hiatus in the payment of teachers' salaries. A still more deadly obstacle was found in the frequently-recurring insurrections on the island. During those years of trouble, the chief anxiety of the Cuban Government was to find money for the payment of troops to put down the insurgents, and large numbers of schools were entirely shut. What the actual condition of elementary education now is throughout the island there is no present means of determining.

The latest tables available for a knowledge of present conditions relate to the year 1893-94. The population given for that year was 1,175,000. The public and private schools numbered 1,255, and the attendance in these was set down at 47,752—a proportion of one school to every 824 inhabitants.

Concerning the position of higher education the particulars are more definite. The Royal University of Havana had in the year 1892 a total of 1,083 students. The expenditure in 1889 was 126,859 pesos. Much of the income was derived from fees. In 1880, for the advancement of secondary education, an institute, incorporated with the central one at Havana, was established in the capital of each province. In Havana 28 colleges were affiliated; in Matanzas, 8; in Santa Clara, 18; in Puerto Principe, 1; in Pinar del Rio, 3; in Santiago, 12. Besides these there is a superior normal school for male teachers, another for female teachers, a "professional" school in Havana, a provincial school for artisans, a large number of "colleges for primary instruction" for boys and girls and Sunday schools for poor servant girls and other young women. Thus it will be seen that for higher and secondary education generous provision was made.

On this subject a writer in the *National Quarterly Review* in 1866 said: "Far from being behind the age in the provision which it made for education, there is not one of our cities, not even the modern Athens, which excels it in that respect. Boston, Philadelphia, New York and one or two other American cities have, indeed, better public schools than Havana. They afford better facilities for the education of the poor. But the higher educational institutions of Havana are on an extensive and liberal scale. We must admit on due examination that we have no institutions that are equal to their free school of design and painting, or their free school of mathematics. The professors in each of these schools have been selected for their superior qualifications in different countries of Europe, a large proportion of them being Germans, French and Italians. If it still seems incredible that Havana has some educational institutions which are superior to those of Boston or New York, we ask is the fact more incredible that the same city has a fine botanical garden in which botany is taught in all its branches by professors who have graduated at the famous Jardin des Plantes, in Paris, and other similar schools, while we have no botanical garden worthy of the name? The capital of Cuba has also a first-class university, one which may be compared to that of the city of New York, and which has separate chairs for jurisprudence, medicine, chemistry, theology, comparative anatomy and agricultural botany."

In Havana, as in most other large Catholic centres, the Jesuits lead in the work. Mr. James Anthony Froude went to Havana in 1887, and thus describes a visit to the Jesuit college of that city and its famous observatory, conducted at that time by the eminent Father Viñez: "They have a college there where there are 400 lads and young men who pay for their education; some hundreds more are taken out of charity. The Jesuits conduct the whole, and do it all unaided on their own resources. And this is far from all that they do. They keep on a level with the age; they are men of learning; they are men of science; they are the royal society of Cuba. They have an observatory in the college, and the Father Viñez, of whom I have spoken, is in charge of it. His name is familiar to students of meteorological science, and he has supplemented and corrected the accepted law of storms by careful observation of West India hurricanes."

One of the most usual bills of indictment brought against the rule of Spain is her alleged neglect of the education of people brought under her dominion. Looking at the situation in Cuba as a whole, and taking into account the conditions which have prevailed there, the charge falls to the ground. Free popular education is an idea of modern days. It did not begin to be realized in the most progressive countries until very recently. Spain appears to have been as early in the field with it as any other power, and if local circumstances interfered with her purposes, it is not fair to lay the blame altogether upon her shoulders. Again contrasting the rule of England in Ireland with that of Spain in Cuba, it will be found that down to the middle of the last century the position of the Irish masses as regards education must have been on a par with that of Cuba, for all the Government did for them, were it not for the splendid services of the Christian Brothers. There were no public schools until after 1840, and these when started had so strong an anti-Catholic bias that the people shunned them. As for higher education, there is no comparison whatever possible between the two cases. To the present hour the British Government stubbornly refuses to propose a grant for a Catholic university, or to give any support whatever to higher education for Catholic purposes.

Bearing in mind the slow pace of general education on the two great continents and the European islands which lead the way, no one will be astonished to read of Puerto Rico that until the year

1837 education of all kinds was greatly neglected, and that many of the towns were without a primary school. The same thing might be written with perfect truth of many countries whose geographical position was a million times more favorable for the reception of the early impulses of the mind-wave which breathed over the world only when the eighteenth century had passed into the vortex of the had-been. But what does really astonish one to read is that in that remote dependency, where plantation life and agricultural pursuits formed a constant clog on intellectual effort, by the year 1861 there was in every town in it a public school, besides private ones in the towns of the higher grade! There were no fewer than six public schools in the one town of San Juan in that year, besides four private ones, together with a seminary which boasted of three professorships, with teachers of French, English, mathematics and design. In the year 1879 Don Manuel Quinisna y Corton published a text book on Puerto Rico in which he gave particulars of the school conditions, there being at the time an estimated population of seven hundred thousand on the island, one-half being whites, the rest presumably plantation negroes. In that year there were three hundred and sixty-three public schools in operation, with an attendance of more than twelve thousand pupils. Various tables and statements regarding the rate of educational progress are presented in the Report now under consideration, some representing the condition of affairs as deplorable, others putting forth such facts and figures as are calculated to produce the very contrary impression. The impartial reader, after weighing the contradictory testimony, cannot, however, resist the conviction that from the period when the educational impulse was first felt in Puerto Rico—namely, about the year 1861—down to the time when it passed from under the dominion of Spain, the rate of progress has been tolerably good. A brief tabular statement from the report of the Governor of the island, through his secretary, to the Madrid Government, covering the period from 1864 to 1881, will give a better idea of the energy with which the movement was taken up once a beginning had been made:

Year.	Public Schools.			Attendance			Expenditures.
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Pesos.
1864	74	48	122	2,396	1,092	3,488	36,857
1867	240	56	296	7,543	1,929	9,472	90,834
1869	246	67	313	6,192	1,937	8,129	88,133
1878	238	91	329	7,523	3,474	11,097	129,456
1880	328	104	432	10,736	4,482	15,218	191,158
1881	384	117	501	18,025	6,095	24,120	262,669

There is a big hiatus in the official reports—from what cause does not appear—nothing being shown in the way of school statistics from 1881 down to 1898, when Dr. Carbonnell, secretary of an institution called "Fomento," in Puerto Rico, prepared some for the United States Government. His figures give a total of five hundred and ten public schools and forty-four private ones, with a total attendance of twenty-eight thousand, and entailing a total outlay of over three hundred thousand pesos. The number of children (white and black) left without school accommodation in the same year was close on ninety-four thousand. In considering the large disproportion of children thus left out in the cold, so far as school was concerned, we must not forget the fact that the war with Spain had arisen to disturb conditions in the island, and that with the cessation of the Spanish system came a breakdown in various sources of sustenance for the public schools as well as for religious and charitable purposes. There had been more agencies at work, however, for the education of the people of Puerto Rico than those enumerated in these tables. In a work published in 1878 by Don Manuel Ubeda y Delgado, a Spanish military officer, we read:

"In the capital also we find several charitable institutions where gratuitous instruction is given, notably (1) the Casa de Beneficencia, constructed in 1841-1847 with donations from the people of the province, and which gives asylum to an average number of 140 boys and 120 girls, who are given primary instruction as well as taught music and for whom there are workshops in which they are taught shoemaking, carpenter work, tailoring and cigar making for boys, and needle work, washing, etc., for the girls, under the direction of eighteen Sisters of Charity. (2) The College of San Ildefonso, erected by the charitable efforts of benevolent bodies, occupies a vast edifice, in which poor girls to the number of 36 are educated up to the age of 20 years, and there is room for 24 boarders besides outside scholars, all under the direction of the Sisters of Charity. Under their guidance also is the school for infants, in which an average number of 150 children of both sexes are instructed, the age limit being from three to seven years. There is also a military school with the captain general as director and the chief of battalion occupying the barracks as sub-director."

True to their policy of always leading the van, the Jesuits appear to have been foremost in the work of education in Puerto Rico from an early period. Their professors taught in the college of secondary instruction, and with the most excellent results. Those who took the degree of bachelor of arts in this institution, remarked Don Manuel Ubeda y Delgado, ranked with the best of those who enter universities. The list of studies he enumerates shows, indeed, that the intellectual fences to be taken by the contestant were high stone walls and water jumps. They included Latin and Spanish grammar; Latin analysis and translation; Greek translation; psychology, logic and moral philosophy; rhetoric and poetry; Christian doctrine and sacred history; Spanish history, descriptive geography; Latin and Spanish composition; general history; arithmetic and algebra; elements of geometry and plane trigonometry; elements of physics and chemistry; outlines of natural history.

A tolerably good attempt at both *trivium* and *quadrivium*, one may say, looking over this programme of essentials. Besides the college wherein these studies were carried on, the Jesuit professors also conducted a special seminary wherein a few students were trained for particular professions.

In any exegesis of the educational conditions of Cuba and Puerto Rico account must be taken of the indolent character of the creole population. Temperament has much to do with the natural desire for intellectual advancement. A proof of the enormous power of this sort of *vis inertiæ* is found in the small attendance of children in the Puerto Rican schools, even now that the law of compulsory education is supposed to be operative.

It is useful here to pause and contrast, so far as the relative conditions enable us to contrast, the efforts which Spain made to educate her colonial Indian population with those made by England among similar populations elsewhere. England has been nearly as long the dominant power in the East Indies as the Spaniards had been in the Western ones when we expelled them. It is remarked by Professor Reimer, in a paper on "Education in India" given in the same Report, that England paid no attention to the educational status of her dependency until the year 1781, when Warren Hastings, the notorious Governor General, founded the Calcutta Madrasa for the education of Mahommedans, and incidentally gave some help toward educating Eurasians and Hindoos. The world has been making gigantic strides forward in the same direction since then, but it can hardly be said that either the East India Company or its successor, the British Government, did much to enable the Indian people to keep pace with the leaders. There is not even now any general system of education, nor any compulsory law of school attendance. No doubt there are peculiar difficulties in the way, owing to the multiplicity of races, religions, philosophical systems and languages, and, most formidable of all, the all-pervading and all-paralyzing caste system. But this apology or excuse may be met with the rejoinder that where it has been found feasible, with all these difficulties, to establish a generally operative and uniform system of taxation for revenue purposes, it ought not to be found altogether impracticable to provide for the public school. But how disproportionate to the magnitude of the object were the efforts made by the British rulers of India may be gleaned from the few facts on the present situation set forth synoptically by Professor Riemer:

"From the census of 1813 it was discovered that on the average in British territory one person in thirty-nine, including women, could read. In the native States of Northwestern India in 1849, before England annexed those provinces, one in forty-one males could read.

"In the year 1822 Sir T. Munro, then governor of Madras Presidency, distressed at the rapid decline of literature and the arts, began a series of investigations in his province on educational lines. From his report, made in 1826, we give this summary: The number of schools and colleges, so called, in the Presidency is 12,498 and the population is 12,850,941, which supplies a school for every 1,000 people. But the governor argues that half the people are women, who are not regarded by the Hindoos as proper subjects of education, so that existing schools are in the ratio of one to every 500 of the people.

"The Board of Revenue, commenting on this matter, concluded that only one in sixty-seven of the population is receiving any education whatever. It then proceeds to halve the population, enumerating only males, then it reckons only those boys between the ages of five and ten years, or school age, then it adds the number of private pupils discovered by the census, and thus makes as its final result that one boy out of three of school age is receiving instruction. Naturally we demur at such juggling with figures.

"Later investigations were made by Lords Bentinck and Elphinstone in the Calcutta and Bombay Presidencies. The general result arrived at by these worthy investigators was that on the average about one boy out of every ten of the proper age was, in 1820-1840, receiving some kind of indigenous education."

Much is now being heard in the way of comparison between the civilizing power of England and that of any other of the colonizing nations. We may very well place the policy of the much-anathematized Spaniard beside that of the Englishman on many matters connected with relation to outside races, and ask any candid critic which of the two really deserves to be regarded as an exponent of civilization. That much-abused word should never be judged by isolated instances, but from the plane of broad historical permanency. Not long ago an unimpeachable Irish witness, Mr. Alfred Webb, making a tour of India, found in many hotels a notice hung on the wall requesting guests "not to beat the servants"—a striking comment upon the present attitude of the people who for three hundred years have been introducing the ways of European refinement into the Indian peninsula. In all the countries settled by Spain, on the other hand, the absence of distinctive barriers between the different races is the chief fact which challenges the attention and compels the admiration of every truth-seeking traveler. The bringing about of such a state of mutual contentment among different races was in itself an educational achievement, if the end of education be to soften natural antagonisms and allay the jealousies and suspicions of man toward his fellow. Not the faintest notion of striving for such a result has the British Government, so far as India is concerned, ever entertained. The mutual hatred of the different races, the scorn of caste toward caste—the irreconcilable feuds of mountain tribes—these discords are her towers of strength and imperial citadel.

Perhaps the paper devoted to the Philippines is the most valuable of Mr. Packard's trilogy, as indicating the frame of mind in which he approached the general subject. The postscript, as in a good many other cases of literary composition, contains the motive of the whole. The author concludes that "the few Spaniards in the Philippines, while they have not made a radical or decided change in the customs and habits of thought of the natives, have nevertheless imposed their religion upon them to a considerable extent, have taxed them successfully and have them under military control." This is one of the conclusions arrived at, and before proceeding to examine any of the others, it is useful to take the foregoing sentence asunder and observe the volume of self-stultificatory assertions it succeeds in cramming into a couple of score words. How can it be possible, one may ask, to impose a new religion like the Christian upon a people formerly steeped in paganism without making a radical change in at least their "habits of thought?" Of the "customs" of such a people there can be nothing useful said, since of what these customs were previous to the arrival of the Spaniards there is nothing known beyond the broad facts that slavery was an institution in the archipelago, that piracy prevailed wherever opportunity presented itself, that the natives worshiped sun, moon and stars, thunder and lightning, the trees, the rocks, the rivers and springs, the sea, the clouds and other things of nature. But these general statements give no clue to the customs which pertained to institutions and beliefs. In the absence of such knowledge it is safer to say that if the Spaniards succeeded in imposing their religion upon such a people, they made as radical a change in their "customs," when these included barbarity and immorality, as they did in their habits of thought. The Spaniards might not have attempted to break down the rude political system—a sort of tribal one—which they found existing in the islands when they came; but we have unquestionable evidence, in the shape of numerous royal decrees on the subject, that the first great reform to which the Government devoted its attention was the abolition of slavery in the archipelago, so far as their jurisdiction extended. In the voluminous evidence cited by Mr. Packard as proof of their action this fact is more than once prominently brought forward. How any dispassionate chronicler can reconcile such a reform with the statement that no change of any consequence followed the introduction of Spanish rule and the Spanish religion it is not easy to divine. It is impossible to avoid the suspicion that such clumsy reasoning is the consequence of a desire to make wild theories of prejudiced and ill-informed writers fit in with the indisputable facts of the present situation in the Philippines, both as to religion and education. It is the old hackneyed myth, so often urged by jaundiced rivals, that the great spiritual conquests of Loyola, Xavier and the illustrious bands who followed in these great souls' wake were mere slapdash feats—baptism without instruction, alteration without conversion. One of the authors relied upon by Mr. Packard (Semper: "Die Philippinen und ihre Bewohner") puts this scandalous charge very plainly in the case of the islanders. "The ceremonial of the monks," he says, "appealed for several reasons to the imagination of the natives, and they were eager to adopt or assimilate the religion which it represented. With comparatively few exceptions they have never understood the symbolism, but have remained half Christian and half pagan to this day."

Many other authorities are cited by Mr. Packard in support of this favorite theory of Spanish success in the conversion and civilization of aboriginal races. It is needless here to adduce more. What we have reproduced serves to indicate the spirit in which he has approached his subject. Weighing it all and recalling the fact that the grand ruling principle in most American pedagogic minds in the secular world is the dissociation of religion from education, one is naturally inclined to ask why it is that in this inquiry so much care is taken to implicate one with the other, as if in the writer's mind they are and should be interdependent, the sins of the one being traceable to the inactivity or neglect of the other? But in refutation of the charge that the religion of the mass of the Philippine islanders is only skin-deep, we may appeal to one pregnant sentence from a Protestant writer, Mr. Peyton, of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, who recently returned from a considerable tour of the region: "They are the most religious and moral people in all the world."

When one takes into consideration the numerous formidable obstacles which had to be surmounted by those heroic religious who undertook the civilizing of the Philippine tribes, even the most prejudiced must admit that the results are astonishing. The tribute paid by Mr. Peyton is perhaps the highest that can be extorted, if we concede that the chief end of education ought to be to make people exemplary in their lives and pious in their hearts. Letters are but a means to this end—in themselves valueless, save as stepping-stones to the higher life of thought and spirit. The distinguished German ethnologist, Blumentritt, who made a prolonged study of the Filipinos, arrives at the conclusion that inherently they possessed a high capacity for education, and rates their intellectual qualities above those of the best race of American Indians. This fact explains in some measure the very large percentage of the Filipino masses who are able to read and write. No doubt this high natural capacity was greatly favorable to the religious orders when they set about their task of instructing the natives; but over against this advantage must be placed the obstacle arising from the multitude of dialects spoken in the archipelago. These dialects—or more properly speaking, languages—are no fewer than thirty-one. The seemingly partial writer previously quoted (Semper) asserts that before the Spaniards came the natives could read and write in alphabets of their own, and that consequently the task of teaching them was easy. He does not adduce any authority for this statement, and the reader is therefore entitled to take it at his own valuation. Seeing that Semper also tries to show that the conversion of the natives to Christianity was little more than the giving new names to old forms of pagan superstition, one is justified in attributing a jaundiced motive to his writings on religion and education in Catholic countries. The large percentage of natives who availed themselves of the secondary schools and the university, as soon as the Spaniards placed such superior facilities within their grasp, confutes the argument of Blumentritt (who, too, seems utterly unable to say a good word for Catholicity or Spain) that "the whole Spanish colonial system signifies a policy which makes great promises and wakens ambition, but does not keep its promises and disappoints the aroused ambition." From the Philippine colleges and universities have come forth many bright living refutations of that invidious charge. The author who advances it himself furnishes the names of the most illustrious—statesmen and soldiers like Dr. Rizal, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Mariano Ponce; artists like Juan Luna y Novicio, whose great painting, "Spoliarium," was reproduced in the Leipzig *Illustrirte Zeitung;* ethnographers like Isabel de los Reyos y Florentino, and linguists like Pedro Serrano Laktar—men whose reputation is world-wide amongst learned circles.

As in South America, the first thing to which the Spanish religious orders devoted themselves, beside the salvation of souls, was the erection of the school house and the establishment of the college. Mr. Packard quotes from numerous authoritative works an array of facts which speak eloquently for the sincerity and celerity of the Spanish orders in the prosecution of this noble aim. He shows how early the work was begun, after the establishment of Spanish rule, which could not be said to be permanently done until the close of the sixteenth century; yet as early as the year 1585 the Spanish King ordered that a college should be established in which the sons of the Spaniards of the archipelago could be educated under the direction of the Jesuits, but the institution—the college of San José—was not opened until 1601. Its first students were sons or relations of the early authorities of the country. In 1630 the college of San Juan Latran was founded by a charitable individual for the orphans of Spaniards. The founder became a Dominican, and the institution remained in charge of that order. Besides the orphans, a large number of boarders, both "Indians" and mestizas, received instruction there until both it and the college of San José were included in the institute in 1870. In 1632 the college of San Isabel, for Spanish orphan girls, was founded, in charge of the Sisters of Charity. In 1694 a mestiza named Ignacia del Espíritu Santo founded the Beaterio de la Compañía, which still exists, and which was soon attended by many Indian girls and mestizas. Other beaterios came into existence later. The convent school Santa Potenciana was founded as early as 1589. The college of Santo Tomás was founded by the Dominicans in 1611 and was formally opened in 1619. Pope Innocent X. conferred the title of university upon it in 1645 with the two faculties of theology and arts, which were subsequently enlarged by Clement XII. by the addition of the faculty of law in 1734. The King became the protector of the university in 1680, and it received the additional title of "royal" in 1785. Its courses and faculties were reorganized in 1870 with the title of University of the Philippines. It had 581 students in 1845 and nearly 1,000 in 1858. Senor Agoncillo, representative of Aguinaldo, the insurgent leader, himself a graduate of the university, says that the total number of graduates is 11,000.

As in every other place where they established themselves, the Jesuit Fathers were foremost in the great work of education. They had set up in Manila and Cavite four colleges, one each in Cebu, Mindanao and Iloilo and two in the Marianne Islands, when the order was expelled in 1767. They were reinstated in 1862 and have now a dozen colleges in charge. Besides they supervise the scientific department of the renowned University of Manila. The observatory there is one of the most valuable institutions of its kind in the whole world. The work done in this establishment would in itself furnish material for several articles; hence it must for the present suffice to mention it merely here.

Regarding the condition of primary instruction in the Philippines, while no specific data regarding its present working are available, the fact that Semper finds that "every village in the province has its public school" speaks volumes. The larger towns appear to have an abundance of schools. That these schools are presided over by the local priests, of course affords to this and other writers a source of complaint, although for what reason it is not deemed necessary to say. To writers of this bias there is no virtue in any teaching that is not wholly secular.

The latest date at which any statistical information regarding the public schools was obtainable was the year 1890. Then there were in operation 1,016 schools for boys and 592 for girls in the Philippine archipelago, with a total attendance of 98,761 boys and 78,352 girls. That the boys and girls are not educated in the same buildings appears to be another grievance in the minds of secular commentators. The government, in the year named, appropriated the sum of $404,731 for public education.

Besides primary, intermediate and university education provision was made by the Spanish Government for other special lines. By royal decree of October 1, 1890, the School of Arts and Sciences was established at Manila. Here were taught languages, bookkeeping, higher mathematics, chemistry, natural history, mechanics, political economy, mercantile and industrial legislation, drawing, modeling, engraving, wood carving and all the trades. A school of agriculture was established at Manila July 2, 1889, for the purpose of giving such natives as had acquired a common school training a theoretical and practical education in agriculture and horticulture. Similar schools were also established in the provinces of Isabela de Luzon, Ilocos, Albay, Cebu, Iloilo, Mindanao, Leyte and Jalo. They were supported entirely by the government and managed by the clergy.

From this necessarily brief summary it will be easily discerned that no charge of neglect in the field of education, so far as the Philippines are concerned, lies at the door of the power which until lately ruled over them. Whatever the faults of the Spanish colonial system, no one can charge that it endeavored to keep the light of knowledge from the aborigine or degrade him because of the color of his skin.

It cannot but be admitted that the Commissioner of Education is fully sensible of the magnitude of the work done by those who brought this civilization to the Philippines, though he is conservative in his comments upon the subject. He makes a number of recommendations respecting the lines upon which the work should be taken up by the American Government, and we have no doubt that his views will carry weight. The general principles he lays down do not exclude religion from the purview of the pedagogue. The ends of civilization, for instance, he thus summarizes:

"Civilization enables man to conquer nature and make it his servant; to command the services of heat, light, electricity and of all inorganic elements; to command the plant world of vegetation for his uses; to command also the animal kingdom for the same service; in short, to command the services of nature for food, clothing and shelter. Besides this control over nature, civilization should give man access to the history of his race, access to its literature, access to its scientific discoveries, access to its various inventions, and, *above all, access to its moral and religious ideals.* Civilization, in short, should give man command of the earth and likewise command of the experience of the entire race. This shows the goal ahead of us and not merely our partial realizations."

The clause here italicized (by us) is very significant. "Above all" the moral and religious ideals of a people are those barred out by the public school policy of this country, so far as the school house is concerned. They may be striven for outside by the pupils and their friends, if they are desired; but if they are not, they may be relegated to the planet Mars. They had full place in all the Spanish system, and the effect of this generous policy is seen in the splendid moral qualities of the people of the Philippine archipelago. Will our Government have the wisdom to follow this large-minded policy? Will it have the courage to shake itself free from the fetish of secularism and allow those Catholic peoples, who have been always accustomed to the name of the Deity and all holy things in their school houses, to continue this salutary system? This is the question which demands more judgment and statesmanship than that of tariffs, taxation or navigation laws. It will not do to insist that "American" principles must determine it. While it is proposed to omit American principles from the form of civil government about to be introduced in those possessions, no one can consistently demand that such principles shall be imposed in the sole matter of the people's education; for such a course would be merely to stultify those who would have the hardihood to propose it.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

I.—LOWERING CLOUDS.

IN a former number of this *Review* the present writer endeavored to show that the movement known as the Reformation of Religion in Scotland was principally political rather than religious. It was pointed out that Henry VIII. and the traitor nobles of Scotland plotted in concert to serve their individual ends, and that the weak party of reformers were enabled to work the mischief they had in view under shelter of their powerful and unscrupulous patrons in the temporal order.

The havoc they wrought is evident to this day; yet how it was brought about, considering the means employed, cannot but be matter for surprise. There is little doubt that the reforming party alone would never have been successful without the help of the nobles; while these latter were the hands as compared with the directing brain power—brute force, incompetent if not guided. Yet still there remains scope for wonder that, spite of even the most powerful means, a whole nation could be turned as one man to execrate what they had hitherto held sacred; as though another and an unholy Remigius had mockingly repeated that historic apothegm, "Burn what thou hast hitherto worshiped: adore what thou hast hitherto burned."

Not that the whole nation did so turn; the sequel will witness to the contrary; yet to the superficial reader of history—especially as set forth by Protestant historians—it would appear as though it really did. So seemingly sudden and so appalling the catastrophe that the mind stands aghast at the contemplation of it. For, granting that the Scottish nation as a whole were not willingly and easily led into deadly heresy, yet it is beyond dispute that the reformers, in the long run, won over both a powerful and a numerous following.

What, then, was the reason of this apparently sudden change? It was not so much that the doctrines promulgated during the Reformation period were welcomed with avidity by the people as that the teaching of Knox and his fellows fructified speedily in a soil already prepared by heretics of a century earlier. This is a fact to be steadily borne in mind, for it helps to explain what would otherwise be inexplicable.

The history of England abundantly testifies that the first serious revolt against the authority of the Catholic Church was that instituted by Wickliffe and his Lollards. The principles which these heretics introduced blossomed eventually into the overthrow of religion under Henry VIII. "Out of the floating mass of opinion which bore the name of Lollardry," says Green, "one great faith gradually evolved itself, a faith in the sole authority of the Bible as a source of religious truth."[1] For it should be borne in mind that in spite of continued repression the heresy of Wickliffe continued to flourish in England up to the Reformation itself. Speaking of the reign of Henry VI., the historian already quoted remarks: "Lollardry still lived, in spite of steady persecution, as a spirit of religious and moral revolt."[2] Lingard, referring to Henry VIII., says: "In his third and thirteenth year the teachers of Lollardism had awakened by their intemperance the zeal of the bishops."[3] But better proof than all, Protestants such as Foxe in England and Knox in Scotland gloried in claiming the Lollard "martyrs" as their pioneers in the diffusion of "gospel light." Of this, more hereafter.

The precise period at which the Lollards gained a hearing in Scotland is not evident. "The seeds of *freedom*," as Froude puts it, "were scattered simultaneously in England and Scotland, and the initial symptoms of growth in both countries are visible together."[4] It seems not unlikely that some of the preachers of this heresy came to Scotland in the train of the Duke of Lancaster, their patron, who was compelled to seek refuge in Edinburgh at the time of Wat Tyler's insurrection, in 1381. If such were the case, the favorers of Lollardism followed out their opinions in secret for some years; for it was not until 1407 that they dared to promulgate their errors more openly.

It was during the regency of the Duke of Albany, while the young monarch James I. was being detained at the court of Henry IV., that the English priest, John Resby, was denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities as a teacher of heresy. A council of clergy under Lawrence of Lindores, a distinguished doctor of theology, proceeded to examine the case. Resby was charged with having upheld forty erroneous propositions. Bower, the historian, only specifies two of these—that the Pope *de facto* was not the Vicar of Christ, and that no one could be Christ's Vicar who was not a man of personal sanctity. From other sources we learn that he denied the Sacrament of Penance and necessity of confession. Lindores is allowed by even Protestant historians to have successfully refuted the arguments of the heretic, and since Resby refused to recant, he was handed over to the secular power. The regent is described by Wyntoun thus:

---

[1] "Short History of the English People," chap. v., sect. v. [2] Ibid, chap. vi., sect. I.
[3] "History of England," vol. v., p. 113. [4] Froude: "History of England," vol iv., p. 57.

"He wes a constant Catholyke;
All Lollard he hatyt and heretike."[5]

It is, therefore, not surprising that Resby underwent the recognized punishment of the law as it then existed, and was burnt at the stake at Perth, together with his condemned books and writings.

As this was the first instance of the infliction of capital punishment for heresy in Scotland—for it seems probable that legislation on the subject had only recently been made, following the example set by England—it may be well to discuss briefly a mode of proceeding which has been so severely criticized by Protestant writers. Some of these seem to lose sight of the fact that at the age in question the crime of heresy was universally held as deserving the extreme penalty of the law, and that not only by Catholics, but by Protestants as well. If Lollards and Lutherans suffered under the Lancastrians and the Tudors, so also did Catholics under Tudors and Stuarts. It is, therefore, unfair to judge the matter from the point of view of the present century, when men's feelings, principles and ideas are all opposed to the theory of punishing spiritual offenses by secular penalties. Men, their manners and institutions can only be rightly judged by the standard of their own times, and at the period in question the justice of the practice of treating what was regarded as heresy as a crime against society was recognized everywhere.

Not that all men in those days advocated the extreme penalty in such cases as most expedient; we have instances to the contrary. When, for example, in Mary's reign the old laws against Lollards were revived and put into execution, Alphonso di Castro, a Spanish friar and Philip's own confessor, dared to raise his voice in protest. In a sermon preached before the court he denounced the handing over of heretics to the civil power as contrary to the spirit and text of the Gospel. By mildness, not by severity, the intrepid preacher declared, were men to be brought back to Christ's fold.[6]

Such sentiments would meet with the approbation of both Catholic and Protestant in these days, and yet, after all, they justify no one in the wholesale condemnation of men who acted according to the principles in vogue at the period in which they lived. Surely Protestant bigotry has much to do with the sweeping denunciations of the burners of heretics; for in a Protestant land such as England, as late as the reign of George III., the crime of stealing a sum of money greater than one shilling was actually punishable with hanging; yet the fact has scarcely provoked comment.

Again, it is a manifest injustice to judge the conduct of Catholics with regard to religious toleration by the standard of Protestant principles. Catholics recognize the doctrinal authority of the Church as one which all are bound to obey; Protestants allow no such authority in this world. In the case of a Catholic, every wilful departure from the fixed standard of truth is a culpable error which deserves punishment; according to Protestant principles, the only standard of truth and falsehood as regards faith is the opinion of each individual. In the one case, a theory of punishments for such offenses is at least conceivable; in the other, it is a contradiction of fundamental principle. But enough has been said on the subject to justify a practice always condemned with more or less vehemence by Protestants, and treated with reticence by timid Catholics.

---

[5] "Cronykil," bk ix., l. 2773. [6] Lingard: "History of England," vol. v., chap. vi., p. 469.

The execution of the heretic Resby did not, unfortunately, prevent the spread of Lollard doctrines. The University of St. Andrews found it necessary, in 1416, to impose upon masters of arts an oath to defend the Church against the attempts of the Lollards; later on, in 1425, Parliament passed a special act against the sectaries. Legislation, however, had no power against the spirit that was abroad. Bower tells us that the doctrines which Resby had preached were secretly cherished by his disciples, only to reappear later on in renewed strength. In 1433 a second preacher suffered the fate of Resby. This was Paul Crawar, a Bohemian, who, under cloak of exercising his profession of physician, came to Scotland to carry on the teaching which Resby had been instrumental in spreading so widely. Arrested in his turn and arraigned before the ecclesiastical authorities, he proved an able and courageous defender of his views and an acute opponent of the learned Lawrence of Lindores. As Crawar obstinately refused to give up his erroneous opinions, he also was handed over to the civil power, and was led to the stake at St. Andrews. The Bishops of Glasgow and Moray, the Abbot of Arbroath and many Scottish nobles had only lately returned from attendance at the Council of Basle, where the errors of Wickliffe and Huss had received special condemnation, and this fact probably tended to rouse the prelates of the Church to fresh vigilance and zeal in the suppression of heresy.

In 1494 we hear of the renewal of proceedings against Lollards. The district of Kyle, in the Diocese of Glasgow, became notorious from the prevalence of heretical teaching, and thirty persons, including several women, were summoned before Archbishop Blackadder, their diocesan, to give an account of their belief. Knox, who had access to records of the process which have since been lost, enumerates thirty-four charges brought against them. From these it is evident that their belief was practically identical with that of Lutherans. They are accused of denying the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist and the necessity and value of sacramental confession, of refusing to allow prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, of forbidding any honor to be shown to relics or images, of maintaining that priests ought to marry and of using scandalous and irreverent language concerning the Pope, bishops and clergy. Some quotations from these charges, which are often interlarded with abusive remarks by Knox himself, will give an idea of the spirit of these heretics, with whom the later reformers were proud to identify themselves.[7] Here are some of them:

"That every faithful man or woman is a priest."

"That the Pope is not the successor of Peter, but where he said 'Go behind me, Satan.'"

"That the Pope exalts himself against God and above God."

"That the Pope is the head of the Kirk of Antichrist."

"That the Pope and his ministers are murderers of souls."

"That the blessings of bishops (of dumb dogs they should have been styled) are of no value." (The interpolation is Knox's own.)

"That they which are called princes and prelates in the Church are thieves and robbers."

"That Christ at His coming hath taken away power from kings to judge."[8]

The spokesman of the party, Adam Reid, seems to have defended his belief and that of his companions with much skill. For some reason, which has never been explained, the Lollards were not punished, but merely cautioned "to take heed of new doctrines and content themselves with the faith of the Church."[9] Knox relates a dialogue between them and the King (James IV.), which even a Protestant historian casts doubt upon. "The scoffing remarks of the accused as given by Knox," says Grub, "could hardly have been tolerated by King James, and, it is to be hoped, are exaggerated in the narrative."[10]

No more notice seems to have been taken of Lollards or their doctrines, and for the next thirty years nothing is heard of them. But, unhappily, heresy was to raise its head still more defiantly and to prove itself an adversary to be feared. As early as 1525 it was found necessary to pass an act of Parliament forbidding the importation of Lutheran books into the kingdom; for constant intercourse with the continent had brought the tenets of the German reformer before the notice of the educated. The first to preach publicly the new error, which seems to have long been spreading secretly among a considerable number of the community, especially in the northern part of the kingdom, was Patrick Hamilton. He was connected both with the royal family and with the powerful house of Arran. In early youth, according to the prevailing custom, he was made titular Abbot of Ferne; but there is no direct evidence, beyond the assertion of Frith, the English reformer, that he was ever ordained priest; indeed, his youth would seem to militate against the possibility, for he was not twenty-five when he died. Being suspected of heretical leanings, he judged it prudent to leave the country, and entered the University of Wittenberg. Here he made the acquaintance of Luther and Melancthon and became an enthusiastic convert to Protestantism. Returning to his native country, he began energetically to promulgate the doctrines he had accepted.

---

[7] "By these articles, which God of His merciful providence caused the enemies of His truth to keep in their registers, may appear how mercifully God hath looked upon this realm, retaining within it some spark of His light, even in the time of greatest darkness." Knox: "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 54. [8] Ibid. [9] Spottiswood: "History of the Church of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 121. [10] "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 389 (note.)

It was not long before his zeal brought him before the notice of Archbishop James Beaton, the Primate, and Hamilton was summoned before an ecclesiastical tribunal at St. Andrews. He was accused of holding, among others, the following heretical tenets: That the corruption of sin remains in infants after baptism; that man is justified by faith alone; that auricular confession is not necessary to salvation; that there is no purgatory; that the Pope is Antichrist. Remaining obstinate in his opinions, he was sentenced to be deprived of all ecclesiastical dignities and privileges and was handed over to the secular power. In accordance with the rigorous laws of the period he was condemned to be burnt at the stake, and suffered in front of St. Salvator's College at St. Andrews, February 29, 1528.

The execution of one so nobly connected created a great impression in the country. Sympathy inclined to the side of the heretic, a man of deep religious feeling, who had in the first years of manhood met his fate with constancy and courage, and his example tended to fan the flame of heresy. Knox relates an anecdote which illustrates the state of things. "A merry gentleman named John Lindsey," he says, "familiar to Bishop James Beaton, standing by when consultation was had (i. e., concerning the punishment of heresy) said: "My Lord, if ye burn any more, except ye follow my counsel, ye will utterly destroy yourselves; if ye will burn them, let them be burnt in hollow cellars; for the smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected as many as it blew upon.' "[11]

As yet the bulk of the nation were free from infection, but it is evident from the continual enforcement of the laws against heresy at this time that the new opinions were gathering strength. A few years after Hamilton's execution other heretics began to pay the penalty of their obstinacy in unbelief. The years 1533-1539 saw many such called to account and punished. The first victim after Hamilton was a Benedictine monk named Henry Forrest. Knox says that he was put to death "for no other crime but because he had a New Testament in English."[12] Foxe, however, who was also a contemporary, relates that Forrest declared that "Master Patricke Hamelton died a martyr, and that his articles were true."[13] As these "articles," which have already been alluded to, were decidedly heretical, such a statement might well condemn Forrest.

---

[11] **Knox**: "History," (ed. 1644), p. 63.

Following the trial of the Benedictine came that of a layman, David Straiton, of the house of Lawrieston, and of a priest named Norman Gourlay. They were brought before the Bishop of Ross, acting for the Primate; James V. himself, "all cloathed in reid,"[14] was present. Both of the accused were condemned and burned "at the *Rude* of Greenside, between Leth and Edinbrug, to the intent that the inhabitants of Fife, seeing the fire, might be stricken with terrour and feare."[15] Their execution took place on August 27, 1534. Several other heretics suffered during this period; among them were Thomas Forret, a canon regular of Inchcolm; Duncan Simson, a priest of Stirling; a layman named Forrester and two Dominican friars named Beveridge and Keillor, who were all burned at Edinburgh in 1539, while a friar minor named Jerome Russell, and a layman, Kennedy by name, suffered at Glasgow in the same year. It should be borne in mind that all these executions were sanctioned by the provisions of an act of Parliament passed in 1535, renewing the old prohibition against heresy and forbidding the keeping of heretical books.

Many of those accused of holding Protestant opinions "burned their bill," or recanted, when brought to justice. The phrase originated in the practice of publicly burning a dry fagot, in token that the heretic destroyed the instrument which would have caused his death. Others fled to the continent at the approach of danger. Among these were Alexander Aless, a canon of St. Andrews, who afterwards became a prominent Protestant theologian in Germany, and Gavin Logie, principal of St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews, besides some of the canons regular of Cambuskenneth. Alexander Seaton, a Dominican, confessor to James V., was a preacher of heresy and a violent denunciator of the bishops. He managed to escape to England, but is said to have retracted his errors before his death. The perversion of any friar or religious is recounted with especial joy by Knox. "Light burst out in the midst of darkness," he says, "for the truth of Christ Jesus entered even into the cloisters, as well of friars and monks as of canons. John Lyn, a gray-friar, left his hypocritical habit and the den of those murderers the gray-friars."[16]

---

[12] Knox: "History," (ed. 1644), p. 66. [13] Foxe: "Book of Martyrs," bk viii. [14] Pitcairn: "Crim. Trials," Vol. I., p. 210.* The red robes were the judicial dress of the period. [15]. Ibid.

Cardinal Beaton, who succeeded his uncle in the primacy, continued the same policy with regard to the promoters of false doctrine, and won the lasting hatred of Henry VIII., as well as of all the Scottish sectaries. It was his zeal for the defense of the Catholic faith no less than his patriotism which eventually led to his assassination by some of the reforming faction at the instigation of the English monarch. Still, compared with the many who had suffered for their opinions under his predecessor, the number condemned to capital punishment during the Cardinal's primacy were few—not more than seven in all. The last of these, George Wishart, whose suspected part in the plot against the Cardinal's life has already been discussed,[17] was one of the prominent members of the Protestant sect. His death created a profound impression in the country. "No single event," says Grub, "during the persecution in Scotland seems to have caused such a deep feeling in the popular mind as the burning of Wishart. . . . The Cardinal became an object of hatred to a large proportion of the people, and those who held the new opinions increased in number and influence."[18] Yet even now, as Knox himself is forced to confess, "the most part of the nobility of Scotland had either given him their bands of manred, or else were in confederacy and promised amity with him."[19]

The only obstacle to the victory of the English party and their allies the reformers was removed by the dastardly murder of Cardinal Beaton. It was at this crisis that Knox came prominently forward as a representative of the cause, in place of his former master, Wishart. By his presence in the Castle of St. Andrews, in company with the Cardinal's murderers, he identified himself with the English party; he had long taken part in the spiritual side of the movement. It was during the fourteen months that he spent in that stronghold that Knox, at the earnest request of his companions, as he says, consented to take upon himself the office of preaching. He had already received priests' orders in the Catholic Church, but had now for some four years professed himself a Protestant. Henceforth he was to figure as the champion of the new religion in Scotland. When, by the help of French allies, the rebels inside the castle were forced to capitulate to the Scottish party, Knox, together with the others, was conveyed to France and condemned to the galleys. Liberated after three years by the intercession with the

---

[16] Knox: "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 68. [17] *American Catholic Quarterly*, April, 1899, p. 74. [18] "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 27. [19] "History of Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 98. *Manred* or *manrent* was the bond of engagement to a superior to take his part in disputes and appear in arms at his call. Vide Jamieson's "Scottish Dictionary."

French King not only of Edward VI. of England, but also of Mary of Guise, the reformer repaired to the court of his Protestant benefactor, and for some five years he did not trouble Scotland, spending his time either in England or in one or other of the reformed continental countries.

Meanwhile Mary of Guise, the Queen Mother, succeeded Arran as Regent in 1554, and her authority was recognized by the estates of the kingdom. A woman of ability and sound judgment, and a conscientious Catholic, she set herself to heal the religious and political divisions which were causing such trouble to the nation, and succeeded in preserving external peace and in gaining the respect of all. It was her policy to tolerate the reforming party as long as they conducted themselves as peaceable subjects; indeed, she has incurred the unjustifiable reproach of having privately favored the new doctrine. Such a charge can hardly stand in face of the constant revilings which Knox heaps upon the head of this much-enduring Queen. He alone of both Catholic and Protestant historians has dared to make the vilest insinuations against her moral character.

The peace which reigned in Scotland till 1555 was broken by the return of Knox from Geneva. His presence helped to rouse the sectaries from their quietude. He thus relates the state in which he found them. "At the first coming of the said John Knox, he perceiving divers, who had a zeal to godliness, make small scruple to go to the Mass or to communicate with the abused sacrament in the papistical manner; began, as well in privy conference as in preaching, to shew the impiety of the Mass, and how dangerous a thing it was to communicate in any sort with idolatry; wherewith the conscience of some being affrighted, the matter began to be agitate from man to man."[20]

The consequence was that Protestantism began again to assert itself openly. Many of the nobility attached themselves to the cause, among them being the Lord James Murray, titular prior of St. Andrews, the illegitimate son of the late King, Lord Erskine, Lord Lorn and others. Knox went from place to place, preaching and "ministering the Lord's table." The Earl of Glencairn became one of his notable patrons. "Divers from Edinburgh and from the country about assembled, as well for the doctrine as for the right use of the Lord's table, which before they had never practised."[21] The report of these proceedings reached the ecclesiastical authorities, and Knox was summoned to give an account of himself before the bishops in the Black Friars' Church, Edinburgh. For some unexplained reason this summons was recalled, and on the very day when he should have appeared before his judges, the reformer publicly preached in the capital to "a greater audience than ever before he had done in that town."[22]

---

[20] Knox: "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 117. [21] Ibid, p. 118.

Emboldened by circumstances, Knox, at the instigation of the reforming nobles, addressed an audacious letter to the Queen Regent, in which, after declaring that the Catholic religion was "a cup invenomed, of which whosoever drinketh (except that by true repentance he after drink of the water of life), drinketh therewith damnation and death,"[23] he goes on to persuade her to embrace the grace offered, to accept the religion he preaches. The Queen read the letter, but mortally offended the writer by a mocking remark upon it, which eventually reached his ears, to one of the Catholic prelates.

Although the reformer was bold enough in writing, scrupling not to apply to black friars the title of "black fiends," to the bishops that of "dumb dogs," and to priests generally the name of "Baal's shaven sort," with many other choice epithets, yet he seems to have thought "discretion the better part of valor" when, in 1556, an invitation arrived from Geneva asking him to become pastor to the Protestant community there. His "apology for our departure," written at the time, shows that he was in fear of his life when he accepted this way out of his difficulties. "Judging with all charity," says a Protestant historian, "it must be admitted that whilst his writings at this season had all the impassioned zeal, his conduct betrayed some want of the ardent courage of the martyr."[24] Knox had scarcely left Scotland when he was again summoned by the bishops. Although he failed to appear, he was tried and judged guilty of heresy, and was burnt in effigy in the market place at Edinburgh. These proceedings led to his "appellation of John Knox from the cruel and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and clergy of Scotland." The very title is evidence of the arrogance with which he assumed the position of sole teacher of truth. Besides defending himself against the right of the bishops to condemn him, Knox in this lengthy document lays down the proposition that prophets and preachers divinely appointed by Christ (Knox, of course, being one) might appeal from the judgment of the visible Church to the civil authority, and maintains, moreover, the duty of every member of the commonwealth to punish idolatry and similar crimes with death. The latter argument seems put forward as a justification of the murder of Cardinal Beaton.

The bold appeal of their leader encouraged the Protestant party to greater publicity in their preaching. The Regent, anxious to keep peace, especially among the nobles, would suffer no steps to be taken against them for some time; at length, under pressure she summoned Methven, a baker of Dundee, and one of the prominent preachers to appear before a council of clergy. He came attended by such a rabble that the Regent was alarmed, and issued a proclamation that all who had no lawful business in the city should depart for the Border, the seat of war at the time, for fifteen days. A number of the Protestants in spite of this forced their way to the Queen's presence at Holyrood and boldly stated their grievances, their spokesman, Chalmers of Gaithgirth, covertly alluding to the coming bribery of the nobles by church property to take the side of the reformers in the words: "We avow to God we shall make a day of it. They (the bishops) oppress us and our tenants for feeding of their idle bellies; they trouble our preachers and would murder them and us; shall we suffer this any longer? No, madam, it shall not be." Knox's description of the scene adds: "And therewith every man put on his steel bonnet." The Regent endeavored to pacify them by gentle words. "There is something touching," says Dom Hunter-Blair, "in Mary's gentle appeal, in her simple broken Scotch, to these rude invaders of her privacy: 'My joys, my hearts, what ails you? We mean no evil to you, nor to your preachers. The bishops shall do you no wrong. Ye are all my loving subjects. . . . We will hear the controversy that is betwixt the bishops and you; they shall do you no wrong. . . . O, my hearts, should ye not love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your mind, and should ye not *luif* your neighbours as *yourselfes?*' Knox's charitable comment on this is: 'O, crafty, flatterer!' "[25]

---

[22] Knox: "History," p. 118. [23] Ibid, p, 401. [24] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 84, note.

The mildness of the Regent still further encouraged the Protestant party. The statue of St. Giles in his church at Edinburgh had been desecrated and destroyed by the reformers. On the feast of the saint, who was the patron of the city, another image was procured and borne in procession, the Queen being present. "Who was there to lead the ring," says Knox, "but the Queen Regent herself, with all her shavellings, for honour of that feast?" When the Queen had retired, the mob, instigated by the reformers, seized "the idol," as Knox terms it, and broke it in pieces, and a riot ensued.

The reformers and the nobles who favored them, growing bolder at their increase of power, invited Knox to return; they stated that persecution had ceased, that the friars were losing favor with the Queen and nobility and that they had a firm hope that God would speedily increase "his flock."[26] Knox replied in the following Octo-

---

[52] "History of the Catholic Church of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 231, note.

[26] "History," p. 121.

ber, 1557. He rebuked them sharply for their lack of courage and tardiness in action, and urged them to bear in mind "that the reformation of religion and of public enormities doth appertain to more than the clergy or chief rulers, called kings."[27] Spurred on by this epistle, the Protestant leaders assembled for consultation, and on December 3 of the same year signed the bond or covenant which played so important a part in the whole subsequent conduct of these men. In it they solemnly engaged to do all in their power to advance the "Congregation" (as their party was henceforth styled) and to "forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof."[28] By the "congregation of Satan" was meant, of course, the Catholic Church.

"The Solemn League and Covenant" having been formed, the reformers proceeded to carry out their designs. They forced the "Book of Common Prayer," lately drawn up for England, upon the parish churches wherever they had the power, ejecting parish priests who refused to allow of the innovation and replacing them by Protestant preachers.[29] The revolutionary character of the movement was now apparent. "Observe," says Bishop Keith, himself a Protestant prelate, "how these men give orders to the whole realm. Such an act would be justly adjudged high treason now; I know not what it might be then."[30]

The Lords of the Congregation were but applying the principle that Knox had all along inculcated upon his followers. The old Lollard doctrine had been furbished up by the new heretics; no man had a right to rule or to teach whose life was not eminent for godliness, and Knox and his followers arrogated to themselves the power of judging between the godly and the ungodly. They constituted the "true Church;" all others belonged to the "synagogue of Satan" or "the Church of Antichrist." Who can blame the Catholic prelates and nobles if, stung by the virulent tongues of the reformers and irritated at their unprecedented arrogance, they should at times have allowed their zeal to go beyond bounds in punishing these delinquents against the laws of both God and man?

The execution of the last Protestant who suffered death for religion in Scotland was certainly impolitic and, as it seems to us at the present day, uncalled for. Walter Milyn, an old man of eighty, had renounced his priesthood and married when he accepted the Protestant teaching in Cardinal Beaton's days. Thrown into prison by that prelate, he had escaped, and after years of retirement began to preach his new belief publicly. He was seized, tried, condemned and executed, his death still further exasperating the growing party of heretics. The leaders of the Congregation used every effort to fan the flame of dissatisfaction which the death of Milyn had enkindled among the people. Their agents moved everywhere, enlisting adherents throughout the country and gaining popular support by every means in their power. Emboldened by success, the Congregation ventured to petition the Regent for toleration. They demanded the privilege of meeting publicly or privately for prayer, at which meeting any qualified person might interpret hard passages of Scripture, and also of administering Baptism and the Lord's Supper in the vulgar tongue.

---

[27] Knox: "History," p. 122. [28] Knox: "History," p. 124. [29] Ibid, p. 125. [30] "History of Affairs of Church and State," p. 66.

The Catholic clergy were willing to grant the liberty of prayers and baptism in the vernacular, provided that everything took place in private; they required, however, that the Catholic teaching regarding the Mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead and the invocation of saints should be upheld. This did not satisfy the reformers. The Regent eventually promised toleration on the two points named in the petition, on condition that no public assemblies of Protestants should be held at Edinburgh or Leith. The fact was, she was anxious to avoid a conflict between parties till the marriage of her daughter, Queen Mary, with the Dauphin Francis, and the recognition of that Prince as King-consort had been ratified by Parliament. Her action towards the reformers, therefore, was dictated by policy merely, and not from any sympathy with their particular views, as Knox would fain have us believe. As a proof of this we have her subsequent refusal to accede to their wishes, when they were anxious to petition Parliament for the suspension of the laws against heresy and the protection of the Congregation in the matter of freedom of teaching.

It is not necessary to dwell here upon a subject which was discussed in a former article,[31] and enquire how it was that the common people were so easily led. An attempt to remedy the neglect of systematic religious teaching—a neglect of which all writers complain—was made by the bishops of the Scottish Church, in the authorized Catechism drawn up at the command of the Provincial Council held in 1552. Besides this work another was published in 1558 with the authority of the Primate; this was stigmatized by Knox "The Twapenny Faith," probably on account of the price at which it was sold. It comprised an instruction on the Mass and Holy Communion. Another work which produced a great effect and induced many waverers to renew their allegiance to the Church was Abbot Kennedy's "Compendious Tractate." This was a clear and detailed explanation of the doctrines of faith and a refutation of the errors then prevalent. Quintin Kennedy was abbot of the

---

[31] *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1899.

Cluniac-Benedictine House of Crossraguel, in Ayrshire. He was not only one of the most learned ecclesiastics of his time, but also one of the most pious and exemplary. The abbot employed his skill in argument in another manner. In March, 1559, an apostate friar named Willock preached in Ayr, where he had formerly been an inmate of the Dominican Convent.[32] His subject was the Mass, which he maintained had been condemned by SS. Irenæus, Hilary, Chrysostom and other Fathers. Abbot Kennedy, hearing of these sermons and suspecting that Willock was trading upon the ignorance of his hearers, offered to show by the Word of God, according to the judgment of the most approved doctors, that whosoever asserts the Mass to be idolatrous is himself a heretic. Willock accepted the challenge and proposed a discussion in St. John's Church. He, however, stultified himself by declaring that he could only abide by the authority of the said doctors as far as they were in accordance with the Scriptures. As it was impossible to accept such slippery conditions, the affair came to nought.

In the month of January, 1558-9, an extraordinary document was found affixed to the gates of all houses of friars, giving warning in threatening language of the treatment they were to expect at the hands of the reformers. The friars, be it noted, were the most fervent of the clergy in preaching the truths of faith, and consequently were proportionately hated by the heretics. The document in question bore the name of "The Beggars' Warning." It was drawn up in legal form; its title ran thus:

"The blind, crooked, bedridden widows, orphans and all the poor so visited by the hand of God as cannot work: to the flocks of all friars within this realm, we wish restitution of wrongs past and reformation in times coming for salvation."[33] After stating that the alms of Christian people belonged to the poor alone, the deed went on to declare that the friars, "whole of body, strong, sturdy and able to work," had stolen them for their own use; that they had built for themselves "great hospitals" to dwell in, and that these of right belonged to the poor. It then called upon them to give up their ill gotten goods that the rightful owners might enter in "betwixt this and the feast of Whitsunday next;" failing to leave, they, the poor, would enter "in whole number (with the help of God and assistance of His saints on earth) . . . and eject" the present possessors utterly. It is difficult to avoid seeing in this effusion the determination to carry out by force what was actually accomplished almost exactly at the date foretold.

It was now evident that a struggle was imminent between the opposing parties in religion. The cry of the reformers against the unworthy lives of some of the clergy had been dinned into the ears of the people till it began to be accepted by the unlearned as a maxim that the truth of the Church was to be tested by the moral character of her ministers. It is extraordinary how Knox and his followers continually seized the opportunity of driving home this sophistry. Some extracts will illustrate this. "The pride, ambition, envy, excess, fraud, spoil, oppression, murder . . . that is used and maintained amongst that rabble of priests, friars, monks, canons, bishops and Cardinals cannot be expressed. I fear not to affirm, neither doubt I to prove, that the papistical Church is further degenerate from the purity of Christ's doctrine, from the footsteps of the Apostles and from the manners of the primitive Church than was the Church of the Jews from God's holy statutes, what time it did crucify Christ Jesus."[34] Again, he promises the people of Scotland that he will "prove the religion which amongst (them) is maintained by fire and sword to be false, damnable and diabolical."[35] In the first petition to the Queen Regent drawn up by Knox, after complaining of the "cruel tyranny" of the clergy, the reformers state that they "seek the amendment of their (the churchmen's) corrupted lives and Christ's religion to be restored to the original purity." All through his writings Knox continually inveighs against the "idolatry" of the Catholic Church and immediately attacks the morals of the clergy as though immorality and false doctrine were inseparable companions. But such sophistry is not peculiar to Knox or to the period in which he lived.

---

[32] Lesley, the earlier writer, says that Willock was a Dominican; Spottiswood, who lived a generation later, calls him a Franciscan. [33] Knox: "History," p. 130.

On their part the clergy, in their frequent assemblies, initiated the necessary reforms, and could the salutary decrees of the Council of Trent have been suffered to extend to Scotland, the result would have been that the Church in that country would have undergone reformation rather than destruction. But measures were taken too late to prevent the catastrophe now imminent.

Knox had been nearly three years on the continent before he made any serious effort to resume his disastrous work in Scotland. During that time he had been occupied in ministering, in company with Whittingham, afterwards Dean of Durham, to the English congregation at Geneva. The boldness which always characterized his writings, if it did not always appear in his actions, was not wanting during this period. The accession of Mary Tudor to the English throne stirred up all his bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, and he burst forth into the slanderous attack styled "The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women." In it he maintained that "To promote a woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion or empire above any realm, nation or city is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to His revealed will and approved ordinance and, finally, the subversion of good order, of all equity and justice."[36] The tract abounds in abuse of Mary Tudor, whom the writer alludes to in such phrases as "cursed Jezebel of England, with the pestilent and detestable generation of papists," "that horrible monster Jezebel of England," "the monstrous empire of a cruel woman," and the like. He lays it down as binding upon "the nobility and estates by whose blindness a woman is promoted to remove from honour and authority that monster in nature; so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea, a woman against nature reigning above man." Moreover, he maintains that those who presume to defend "that impiety" (i. e., of female rule) are worthy of death, and it is a duty "not to fear first to pronounce and thereafter to execute against them the sentence of death."[37] This incitation to rebellion, though ostensibly directed against the English Queen, was equally applicable to the young Queen of the Scots and her mother the Regent, and was doubtless intended to be so read.

---

[34] "Appellation of John Knox." "History," (ed. 1644), p. 365. [35] Ibid, p. 367.

After the formation of the "Congregation" in 1557, the leaders once more tried to induce Knox to return to Scotland. He did not, however, think it expedient to do so, and the Scottish reformers begged Calvin to use his influence to persuade Knox to accede to their wishes. In November, 1558, Mary of England died, and Protestant exiles began to flock home from the continent. Knox at length resolved to take up the work he had begun in Scotland, and accordingly left Geneva in January. His treatise on female government was naturally as obnoxious to Elizabeth as it had been to Mary, and Knox was refused admission to England. He accordingly set sail for Leith, where he landed in May, 1559.

It was a critical moment. The Regent had publicly avowed her determination to prohibit the public exercise of Protestant worship, and to suppress any violent opposition to the established religion. A proclamation was issued forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacraments without leave from the bishops. Some of the reformers had openly disregarded the prohibition, and had been summoned to answer for their contumacy at Stirling. The Easter of that year, as though to emphasize the policy which the Regent intended to pursue, was kept by the court with unusual solemnity of ceremonial—the Queen receiving Holy Communion publicly.

Yet, in spite of the apparent intention of the government to protect religion and to repress heresy with a firm hand, the storm which had been long gathering was soon to break in all its fury over unhappy Scotland.

---

[36] "History," p. 137. [37] "Blast of the Trumpet," "History," (ed. 1644), p. 421. [38] Ibid, p. 434.

Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCH PROPERTY IN THE ISLAND OF CUBA.

THE withdrawal of the authority of Spain from the island of Cuba, effected on the 1st of January, 1899, left the Cuban territory in the hands and under the power and control of the United States of America. But this holding by us of that island, different from the holding by us of Puerto Rico or the Philippine Archipelago, is not to be permanent, or in full, as a result of the exercise of sovereign rights, acquired by conquest and confirmed by cession in the Treaty of Peace; but temporary, limited, and merely in trust for the Cubans, until they may become able, under the guidance of the United States, "to attain," as set forth by President McKinley in his Message to Congress of December 5, 1899, "to that plane of self-conscious respect and self-reliant unity, which fits an enlightened community for self-government within its own sphere, while enabling it to fulfill all outward obligations."

How long that schooling will last, or, in other words, how many years will have to pass before the United States can feel justified in launching into the family of nations a "regenerated Cuba," capable of complying satisfactorily with all her duties, national and international, no man can tell. But the fact is settled, however, and President McKinley has put it as forcibly as possible, that the United States will not "turn adrift a loosely framed Commonwealth to face the vicissitudes which too often attend weaker States whose natural wealth and abundant resources are offset by the incongruities of their political organization and the recurring occasion for internal rivalries."

The duration, therefore, of the American control of Cuba will depend to a great extent upon the Cubans themselves; but no matter how little responsive they may be to the demands of their situation, or how incapable they may prove of comprehending the grave responsibilities which the United States have assumed in freeing them from Spain, the fact cannot be overlooked, or underestimated, that the historical moment of the appearance of the "new Cuba," as a separate, free and independent State, assuming among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle it, is bound to arrive some day.

The joint resolution of Congress, approved April 20, 1898, and the Presidential Message of December 5, 1899, leave no doubt on the subject. Congress declared, and its declaration, through the approval of the President, became a law, binding upon the people and the Government of the United States, as long as it remains unrepealed or unamended, that the United States disclaimed any disposition or intention "to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof," and that it was their determination when that end was accomplished to "leave the government and control of the island to its own people." The President, in his turn, declared also that "the pledge contained in the said resolution is of the highest honorable obligation and must be sacredly kept." It is, therefore, doubtless that no matter how long it may take for "the future to determine in the ripeness of the events" when the coming of the "new Cuba" will take place, that coming will not fail—in the present state of the case—to be, sooner or later, an accomplished fact.

Under these circumstances the question arises naturally whether the condition of the Church in Cuba, after the establishment of the Cuban State, will be better or worse than it is now under the American control of the island, or was before during the Spanish domination, and whether any dangers are, or are not, in store for the Church, her ministers or her property, when the American interregnum ceases and Cuba becomes *de facto* as well as *de jure* an independent Commonwealth.

What has been seen in Mexico ever since 1842, what was witnessed in Spain herself during the first fifty years of this nineteenth century, and what, in greater or lesser scale, has taken place here and there in some other countries, under the influence of so-called "liberal" ideas, might justify the apprehension that, unless the American training proves to be very efficient and thorough, the future of the Church in the island of Cuba is far from being cloudless.

In Puerto Rico, on the contrary, nothing of serious moment can be feared by the Church. Ever since the 12th of August, 1898, when the Peace Protocol was signed at Washington by the representatives of the United States and Spain, Puerto Rico became an American possession, sold by Spain and purchased by the United

States, in consideration of the amounts of money represented by the expenses of the war and by the claims of citizens of the United States against Spain arising out of wrongs done to them in Cuba, from the day of the outbreak of the Cuban insurrection of 1895 to the day of the promulgation of the Treaty of Peace. When this Treaty was concluded at Paris (December 10, 1898) the cession of Puerto Rico by Spain was formally confirmed in its second article. And as that Treaty was approved and ratified and proclaimed on April 11, 1899, there is no doubt whatever that Puerto Rico, although separated by the sea from the United States, is for all effects and purposes an integral part of the national domain of the United States, and that at present, until otherwise determined by Congress, that island is as much under the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Federal authority as the District of Columbia, or any place or territory, large or small, purchased by the United States under the provisions of No. 17, Section 8, Article I. of the Constitution of the United States, is or may be. If it should happen for Puerto Rico, in the future, to be admitted to all the rights and privileges of American statehood, such an admission will do no more than rivet the American character of the island.

This being the case, nothing in the way of persecution of the Church or her ministers, or of confiscation of her property, can be apprehended at all in Puerto Rico on the part of the Government. And if it is true that the so-called union of Church and State, which apparently, and no more than apparently, existed there under the Spanish rule, might be said to have terminated from the very moment in which Puerto Rico became an American possession, if the provisions of the Constitution of the United States were made applicable to it, it is true, also, that the Church in Puerto Rico will be, under the new régime, as free and as full of life and activity and energy, as it is everywhere else within the limits of the United States. Her action and her influence will never be hampered or restricted by civil official interference; and if she will have to look only to herself for material means of support (which in reality always happened to her) she will be free, in exchange, to acquire all kind of property, to hold it, to manage it and to use it according to her discretion, and her right to do so will never be disputed or successfully interfered with by the authorities.

The writer of this paper is not unaware of the fact that the American Commissioners, Mr. Robert P. Kennedy, Mr. C. W. Watkins and Mr. H. G. Curtis, appointed by the President to make "investigations into the civil affairs of the island of Puerto Rico," submitted a report on the 27th of May, 1899, in which, after recommending that "the Constitution and laws of the United States locally applicable shall have the same force and effect in the island of Puerto Rico as elsewhere in the United States" (Report, page 62) they felt justified in suggesting that "all property (of the Church), including cemeteries, . . . be declared the property of the Government, except that churches, used for religious worship exclusively, be allowed to remain in the possession of the congregation now occupying the same" (Report, page 66); that "priests and others who have taken the vow of celibacy may be permitted (in Puerto Rico) to renounce said vows and enter into marriage relations the same as other persons," and that in order "to remedy the evils of concubinage on the island . . . such cohabitation in good faith be declared binding as a common law (or civil law) marriage, and the children legitimate."

But the just discredit incurred by these strange utterances from the very first moment in which they were made public renders their refutation at the present moment unnecessary. Nothing as un-American and anti-American as such jacobinical ideas will ever be permitted to flourish in the United States; and the fact is self-evident that in the event, more than improbable, of any hostile movement, either on the lines suggested by the Commissioners aforesaid, or on any other lines, being ever attempted in this country, an appeal to the Catholic vote, a vote so strong and so much needed, would suffice to restore all things at once to the proper tracks of righteousness and legality.

The future of the Puerto Rican Church, even in regard to material wealth and prosperity, seems to be assured. The Puerto Ricans are Catholic, and Catholic zeal, stimulated and sharpened by the invigorating influence of American ideas and institutions, will work in Puerto Rico the same wonders it has worked in the United States, even in those localities which thirty years ago were distinctive strongholds of bigotry and intolerance. There is no reason to apprehend that the Puerto Rican Church, having become, as she has, through the effects of war and diplomacy, a member of the great American Church, and being placed, as she is, through the same instrumentalities, on exactly the same footing as all the other Churches which constitute the vast and potent unity of the American hierarchy, will not be regulated and conducted as all her sisters are, in so far as all outward manifestations are concerned, in the same manner and according to the same plans, methods and ideas. She will not be less brilliant than the Churches of Massachusetts, Louisiana or any other within the vast area of the United States of America, and the wonderful vitality and potency which characterize those Churches will be equally hers.

This might serve to demonstrate, if demonstration were necessary, the wisdom and foresight of the Holy Father in appointing for the Bishopric of Puerto Rico an American Prelate, American by birth, by education and by intelligent and disinterested attachment to American ideas and institutions. What the Right Rev. Bishop Blenk can do, and will do, in Puerto Rico for the good of the Church, the Puerto Rican people and the people of the United States, do not need to be explained or commended to them. His responsibilities are certainly grave; but his prospects are bright. At all events he is eminently fitted and equipped to bear his burdens gracefully.

In the Philippine Archipelago the situation might be the same as it is in Puerto Rico were it not for the state of war in which unfortunately one at least of its islands is plunged at present. Everything is to be feared from soldiers when engaged in hostilities against people whose language they are unable to understand and whom they consider their inferiors ethnically and in all other respects. The prospect in those islands is therefore very dark, and if the press reports and even the public utterances of over-zealous officers are to be taken as guides, a large amount of trouble is in store for the noble missionaries, whether Augustinian Fathers or Jesuits, to whom all the Christian civilization to be found in that extensive territory, inhabited by not less than 9,000,000 people of different races, customs and ideas, is exclusively due. But as the Philippine Archipelago is now, through purchase, as much an American possession as Alaska or Puerto Rico, the hope may be entertained and cherished that the Washington Government will not lose sight of the fact that by not protecting the Church, or by permitting her to be persecuted or ignored, it will simply throw away, to its own disadvantage, what always was considered with reason the most potential element for the preservation of peace and public order.

The action of the Holy Father in sending to those remote islands as Delegate Apostolic the same eminent prelate who represents his supreme authority in respect to Cuba and Puerto Rico, so well fitted in all respects for his mission, so thoroughly conversant with American ideas and sentiments and with the ideas and sentiments of the people who for convenience sake are called Latin—the Most Rev. P. L. Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans—while illustrating again that admirable wisdom to which reverent reference was made before, furnishes a guarantee that the interests of the Church and the interests of the United States, as well as the interests of the Philippine people, will be blended together.

Turning now our eyes to the island of Cuba, as required by the necessities of the present paper, we shall find, from the very first moment, as stated before, that the condition of things in regard to the Church and her property is full of danger and perplexities. That embarrassing condition of things which President McKinley made an effort to avoid,[1] resulting from the creation in Cuba of a dual status, one American for all practical effects and purposes, but *pro tem.* and indefinite; and another, Cuban, prospective, theoretical and full of contingencies of all kinds, confronts the Cuban Church in the most alarming degree. To all the dangers which are usually in store for Religion when revolutionary ideas, through some strange combination of circumstances, succeed in subverting, whether permanently or temporarily, an order of things which had lasted for centuries, and when infidelity and indifferentism are offered opportunities, never dreamed of before, to do their evil work, some other dangers, not less serious, exclusively depending upon this limitation of the American control of Cuba, must be added.

But while it is true that, generally speaking, the powers of the American Government in political and administrative matters and in matters concerning changes of legislation or other changes of fundamental character, are, and must be, limited by what the Attorney General of the United States very properly called "the reversionary rights of the future Government of Cuba" (Opinion of March 25, 1899, in the case of the application of the Commercial Cable Company to land a cable in Cuba), it is also true that in matters of justice, especially when, as in the case of the Church in Cuba, the faith of the United States is pledged by treaty, no opportunity for coquetting with evil or temporizing with injustice can be allowed for a moment. In matters of that kind the authority of the United States is supreme, as the obligation on their part is sacred, to fulfill their engagements.

Under Article X. of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris on December 10, 1898, and proclaimed at Washington on April 11, 1899, the Government of the United States bound itself solemnly to protect in the island of Cuba, as well as in all the other islands to which that instrument refers, the free exercise of the Catholic religion. "The inhabitants of the territories," so the article reads, "over which Spain relinquishes" (the case of Cuba) "or cedes her sovereignty" (the case of the other islands) *"shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion."*

---

[1] "Nor from the standpoint of convenience," President McKinley said, "do I think it would be wise or prudent for this Government to recognize at the present time the independence of the so-called Cuban Republic. Such recognition is not necessary in order to enable the United States to intervene and pacify the island. To commit this country to the recognition of any particular government in Cuba might subject us to embarrassing condition of international obligation toward the organization thus recognized. In case of intervention our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government. We would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally." (Message to Congress of April 11, 1898.) The prudent advice of the President was not followed, and the United States became the friendly ally and guardian of a "free and independent" people, bound to be left some day to itself.

The learned negotiators of that treaty, all of them men of exceedingly vast information as well as ability and patriotism, were fully aware of the meaning and true import of these words. They all knew what securing the free exercise of a religion means, and they knew also, as everybody does, that that religion, the exercise of which the United States bound themselves to secure in Cuba, was *de jure* and *de facto* the Roman Catholic religion. They knew that it was so, *de jure*, because they knew that the Constitution of Spain of 1876 was the fundamental law of Cuba, and that Article 11 of that Constitution reads: "The Roman Catholic apostolic religion is the religion of the State: the nation binds herself to support its clergy and pay the expenses of worship." They knew also that it was so, *de facto*, because they knew that Protestants in Cuba are *rara avis*, and that the Cubans are always either Catholics or nothing. At present, after fourteen months of American rule, the Protestant churches of Havana, according to the Havana Directory just published, are not more than three: one Baptist, one Evangelical and one belonging to the "Christian Union."

The negotiators of the Treaty of Peace were also aware, as they had to be, that neither the security guaranteed by Article X. of the instrument nor any other obligation contracted either there or elsewhere by the United States in relation to Cuba, could escape the contingency of reversion by the future Cuban Government, which the Attorney General of the United States so distinctly foresaw. In order to meet that emergency they drew up Article XVI. of the compact in the following manner: "It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will, upon the termination of such occupancy, advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations."

In addition to these solemn engagements, the Government of the United States entered into another (Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace), by which it promised that "the relinquishment, or cession (of the Spanish sovereignty), as the case may be, *cannot in any respect impair the property*, or rights which by law belong to the peaceful possession of property, of all kinds, of provinces, municipalities, public or private establishments, *ecclesiastic*, or civic, *bodies*, or any other association having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the aforesaid territories renounced or ceded." It is, therefore, self-evident, under the plain language of this article, that the Government of the United States bound itself to protect the Cuban Church in the possession of the property belonging to her, and to prevent her rights from being impaired by the change of sovereignty.

Unfortunately for all, neither the wise, strong conservatism which is characteristic of the American people and Government, nor the foresight and righteousness of the negotiators of the Treaty of Peace, has proved so far of any avail for the Church. It might be stated, on the contrary, that, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, the first year of the American occupation of Cuba has been disastrous.

The fact cannot be ignored, no matter how sad and deplorable, that the distinguished General who established his headquarters at Havana on the 1st of January, 1899, and was in command of the island until the latter part of December, never seemed to realize the true import of the provisions of Articles VIII., X. and XVI. of the Treaty of Peace, nor to have had any desire or power to comply with them. Political necessity may, perhaps, have caused him to throw himself entirely into the arms of revolutionists, whose extremely radical ideas, or desire of revenge for supposed wrongs, found ready expression in measures of extreme hostility to the Church, her property and her doctrine; and the spectacle has been given of an American high official, personally amiable and intelligent, representing the highly liberal and enlightened Government of the United States, authorizing with his approval and signature real acts of persecution.

See, for instance, his order of May 31, 1899, in regard to marriages. What necessity he could have had for legislating on this subject and changing the wise provisions of the Spanish law, it is difficult to perceive. Article 42 of the Civil Code, in force in Cuba ever since November 6, 1889, reads as follows: "The law recognizes two forms of marriage: the canonical marriage, which is the one which all persons professing the Catholic religion ought to contract, and the civil marriage, which shall be solemnized in the manner and form provided for by this Code." But General Brooke came forth and said: "Hereafter civil marriages *alone* shall be legally valid. The contracting parties may comply with the precepts of the religion professed by them in addition to performing the formalities necessary for the solemnization of the civil marriage." In Article III. of the same order General Brooke permitted clergymen to solemnize marriages according to "their respective religious beliefs," but, he added, "the performance of this ceremony shall have *no civil effect.*"

When the fact is considered that in the forty-five States of this

American Union, and in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories of the United States, there is not a single locality in which a marriage solemnized by a clergyman is not civilly valid, as valid as any other marriage legally solemnized in any other manner or form (A Report on Marriage and Divorce in the United States by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, page 51), the novelty of the reform introduced by General Brooke in a country so essentially Catholic as Cuba means simply an insult.

To make it still graver, General Brooke said: "Article IV. Marriages heretofore solemnized in the island of Cuba shall be deemed and adjudged to be valid, and the validity thereof shall in no way be affected by any lack of authority in the person solemnizing the same. . . . *Provided*, that such marriages be duly recorded (at a certain civil office) within one year to be counted from the date of this order." How this recording all marriages previous to 1899 was to be made in Cuba, and on what evidence, was left (Article VI. of the order) to the discretion of the Secretary of Justice and Public Instruction.

The readers can imagine the effect produced in Cuba among Catholic husbands and wives by an order which compelled them to go to a civil officer to cause their marriages, no matter how old in date, or how strongly sanctioned by the Church and the law, to be graciously validated, and which exposed their children to run the risk of being declared illegitimate.

In addition to this rude attack against the sanctity of the Catholic home and marriage, the spectacle has also been witnessed in Havana during this first year of American control of some other attacks not less rude against the property of the Church.

A house in Havana, No. 40 Cärdenas street, belonging to the Convent of St. Augustin, of that city, lawfully acquired by it through inheritance under the last will and testament of Mrs. María Teresa Entralgo, entered and registered as its property on the books of the Registrar of Property since July 19, 1896, and held and possessed by it without opposition of any kind from any quarter whatever, was suddenly seized and appropriated to the use of the Government on the 29th of April, 1899. The case has been presented and is now being examined by the War Department, and justice will, no doubt, be done without difficulty.

One of the main supports of the Church in Cuba consists in what is called "capellanías," ecclesiastical livings or investments, secured by privileged mortgage and strongly resembling the "ground rents" of the United States. It was in former times and is still frequent among Catholics in Cuba to set apart by a "deed of foundation," or by their last will and testament, a certain sum of money, to be permanently invested in such a way as to secure an interest, never exceeding 5 per cent. per annum, to be used either in alms for Masses for the repose of the soul of the founder or of some other person, or in religious festivities, devotions or other pious purposes.

Under the laws of Spain and the repeated decisions, which in explanation thereof have been rendered by the Supreme Court at Madrid, the said "capellanías" are held to be "ecclesiastical property" from the very moment in which what is called their "canonical erection" by the respective Diocesan takes place. As soon as this *auto de erección canónica* is entered on record and published, no authority other than the Diocesan himself has, under the laws, both canon and Spanish, jurisdiction over them. But those laws have been ignored on the ground that they are incompatible with the present condition of things in Cuba, and in spite of the earnest remonstrances and protests of the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana, whose communications have often been left unanswered, the civil tribunals have taken hold of the matter, a number of "capellanías" have been pronounced "free," the Diocesan has been forbidden to exercise his rights and watch over the interests of the Church entrusted to his care, and under the erroneous notion that "by the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba the Church and the State there became separated," the Church has been allowed to sustain considerable losses and injury. Through proceedings, merely *ex parte*, called in the Spanish law of "voluntary jurisdiction," the Church may be, as she has already been, deprived of a large part of her revenue.

Things have gone to the extreme of even disputing and ignoring the right of the Diocesan to appoint an officer for the collection of the revenues of capellanías and other property belonging to the Church. By judicial decisions of November 10 and December 8, 1899, a decree of the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana, dated December 7, 1897, appointing a collector of Church revenue and ordering all payments to be made to him, it has been held that "said episcopal decree, whatever its efficiency might have been at the time in which it was issued, lacks now moral force *(fuerza moral)*, because by virtue of the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in this island the Church has become completely separated from the State."

The idea does not seem to have ever occurred to the courts which so argued, that from the fact of the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba, or from the fact of the establishment of a republic in the same island, it does not follow at all that the Church and the State have to be separated. The Spanish sovereignty was extinguished in all the countries which are now called Spanish-American Republics, and neither the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty, nor the establishment in them of a republican form of government, brought about *ipso facto* the aforesaid separation. On the contrary, all the original Constitutions and laws of those nations were strongly Catholic; and even now the Constitutions and laws of most of them, including the richest and the most powerful, as Chile and the Argentine Republic, emphatically provide, from the outset, that the Holy Roman Catholic religion is the religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others, and that the State ought to support it and aid it.

Not many days ago the French Republic, which has in Rome an Ambassador representing her government near the Holy Father, and which gives the first place in the foreign diplomatic body at Paris to the Papal Nuncio, refused by an overwhelming vote in her Parliament to expunge from the appropriation bills the provisions intended for the support of the Church.

In this matter of "capellanías" which, owing to its various aspects, religious, legal and financial, is of great importance, clouds of dangerous character seem to have been gathering on the horizon of the Cuban Church. Whether the storm will burst, or will be dissipated, or whether, if it burst, its rage will be felt before or after the advent of the Cuban State, it is difficult to predict. But the black points are there, and prudent men are forced to look at them with concern.

In the "special report" which General Leonardo Wood, Governor of the department comprising the Cuban provinces of Santiago de Cuba and Puerto Príncipe—now Military Governor of the whole island—submitted October 5, 1899, to the War Department, on the condition of things in the territory, which was then, and is now, placed under his authority, the following statements are made:

"Another species of ecclesiastical property which bids fair to cause considerable trouble before the settlement of the country can be effected is found in what are called 'capellanías.'

"A 'capellanía' is a perpetual annuity, payable out of the income of the real property on which it is charged, usually established by testamentary provision and payable to a certain church or certain ecclesiastics, as provided by the will of the founder. It amounts to a perpetual estate in the realty so charged, although provision has been made by law for the redemption of 'capellanías' and the releasing of the property from the incumbrance. The arrears of annual payment due and unpaid accumulate as a lien on the property charged. So many of these 'capellanías' have been created on properties in these provinces and payments have fallen so much in arrears by reason of the continued disturbances in the country that the amounts now due in some cases are in excess of the value of the incumbered property. The effect of this condition is to retard, if not prevent, the rebuilding or reconstruction of properties which have been destroyed or damaged during the war."

The report does not say how or in what manner the removal of such an obstacle to the reconstruction of Cuba can be secured. Certainly no American official, and least of all General Wood, whose superiority of intellect and governmental ability are recognized without difficulty, will ever advise measures of revolutionary character, ignoring the rights of property or coquetting with base subversive feelings of a communistic or socialistic character; and more certainly still no measures of that kind, if advised or adopted, would ever stand for a moment the indignant condemnation of the American people.

On the other hand, the provisions of Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace, which the special report seems to have overlooked, would prevent the United States from impairing the rights of the Church in regard to that property, even if it were as obnoxious and productive of evil results as intimated.

There is one feature, however, in General Wood's report which, if noticed in due time by its distinguished author, might probably have caused all his sayings on this subject to be either omitted or modified. And that feature is, that while the report dwells, with almost undisguised antagonism, on the "capellanías" belonging to the Church and now held by the Church, it maintains a prudent silence in regard to the "capellanías" of the same character taken away from the Church and now held by the State. If this kind of property is obnoxious, because it prevents the reconstruction of the country, it is not less obnoxious when it is in the hands of the government than when it is in the hands of the Church. The Church at least has not the means of coercing payment of arrears, in the shape of heavy penalties and forced sales, which the government has, and to which at this very moment it is mercilessly resorting.

The American authorities of Cuba are now holding (and collecting and using the revenue derived from them) seventy (70) "capellanías," representing a principal of $46,844, and seven hundred and fifty-six (756) "censos," representing a principal of $309,090.08, belonging to the Church, in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba, and eight hundred and ninety-seven (897) "capellanías," representing a principal of $578,214.11, also belonging to the Church, in the Diocese of Havana. The interest on all this money is religiously collected by the American authorities of Cuba, and as late as in the first week of the month of January of the present year 1900 an official advertisement was published in Havana calling all the debtors for interest on these "capellanías" to come and pay into the Treasury, in Spanish gold, within the period of fifteen days, all that was due by them, with the understanding that the failure to do so would make them incur the penalties established by law.

It seems that the rule of alleged public interest which would work against the Church if she would try to enforce the collection of the annual payments due to her, ought to work with the same strength against the American authorities. The obnoxiousness of the revenue does not change when the beneficiary thereof is the American Government instead of the Church.

Those "capellanías" belonging to religious orders of men were, as will be seen hereafter, in the hands of the Spanish Government, not in ownership, but in usufruct, and in consequence of arrangements under which the government collected and used the revenue, but supported, in exchange, and within certain limits, the original owners. When the Spanish rule ceased they were transmitted and transferred, such as they were, to the American Government. If the American Government enjoys this revenue, as Spain did, it has to pay, as Spain did, its equivalent to the religious orders to which they lawfully belong.

It is perfectly clear that if it proves to be true that the accumulation of arrears of interest will entail, if the payment thereof is uncharitably enforced, the ruin of the present owners of the estates, the Church will be the first to recognize, as always, the great truth which is involved in the principle *summum jus, summa injuria*, and be ready to display that moderation and kindness which are inherent in her nature.

But one thing is to yield and to condone, by voluntary act, and for considerations of public good, what is ours and what is due to us, and another thing, very different, is to impair by legislation, or still worse by military orders, the obligations of the contracts.

The gravest blow, however, which during this first year of American control of Cuba has been aimed against the Church of that island has been the stopping at once, without notice, as if it were a matter of course, and in spite of the provisions of Articles VIII. and X. of the Treaty of Peace, of the payment of the amounts annually due to the Church by the government under laws which were in force in Cuba when the Americans took possession of her territory—laws which have not been repealed thereafter and which, owing to their own nature as involving contractual obligations, can never be repealed or amended.

As will be seen hereafter, in order to obviate the difficulties which might have arisen out of the necessity to return at once to the Church, as ordered by the Concordat of March 16, 1851, all the property which had been taken away from her during the period of persecution which preceded that solemn compact, laws were enacted under which the government was allowed to retain certain property which could not be easily returned, on condition, however, that the title of the Church to that property should not be impaired by the retention, and that the government should pay to the Church, in compensation for the use of that property and out of the revenues thereof, if sufficient, a certain amount of money to be determined annually by agreement between the Right Reverend Archbishop of Cuba, the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana and the Governor General of the island.

By virtue of these provisions the sum of $461,411 was disbursed by the government in 1890-1891 and other fiscal years for the so-called "support" of the Cuban Church: $125,840 for the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba and $335,571 for the Diocese of Havana. The total amount disbursed in 1896 for the two dioceses was $403,149.

The sudden stoppage of these payments might have done to the Church all the harm which was probably contemplated and enjoyed beforehand by her enemies, if the Providence of God had not, as always, been on her side. The delinquency of the American authorities in refusing to pay these sums, which were not by any means a present made by the government or a subsidy or assistance granted to the Church by the government, but an equivalent in money for the use made by the government of buildings or of revenue or property belonging to the Church, has been productive, of course, of considerable distress and anxiety among the clergy in Cuba, specially in the high ranks of the hierarchy; but it has not succeeded in stopping the "free exercise" of the Catholic religion, or in diminishing the splendor of Divine worship.

Under this new régime, which is in violation of the Treaty of Peace, in violation of the laws of Cuba, in violation of contractual obligations and in violation of all principles of justice and equity, the priests have been reduced to a condition of poverty which they had never known before, but which they have borne with that fortitude which becomes their ministry. As intimated before, only the heads of the Church, the Right Reverend Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba and the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana may be said to have been left, as far as their personal support is concerned, either to their own individual resources or to the love and religious zeal of the faithful.

It is confidently expected that the American Government, when fully impressed with the idea that it cannot *secure* the free exercise of the religion of the country in Cuba by tending to make any proper exercise of the said religion impracticable, and when fully convinced that it cannot consistently continue to retain and use the Church property and cease to pay for it, will hasten either to return to the Church what is hers, or to enter into arrangements with the respective Diocesans to pay for its use.

Let it be said here, and repeated as persistently and reverently as possible, that if the prudence and wisdom of the Holy Father have been so strikingly illustrated by his appointments for the See of Puerto Rico and his personal representation in the Philippine Islands, those made by him for Cuba are in excess of all praise. The selection of a Cuban by birth, and such a learned, pious and venerable Cuban as the Right Rev. Francisco de P. Barnada, for the Archiepiscopal See of Santiago de Cuba, and of a Prelate so near to his august person, so conversant with American matters and with the diplomacy of the Church, so learned in law and ecclesiastical sciences, so strange to any contention between Cubans and Spaniards or Cubans and Americans, so universally respected for his tact, his exemplary virtues and his piety, as the Right Rev. Donato Sbarretti, for the Episcopal See of Havana, are certainly calculated to secure the result, that whatever the storm may be through which the Church must pass in Cuba, she will come out, in the end, as she always does and has done, gloriously triumphant.

In all questions relating to the property of the Church in Cuba a distinction must be made between the property belonging to the Church as represented by the secular clergy and the property belonging to the Church as represented by the religious orders. The laws and precedents regarding each one are different, and no intelligent solution of any problem relating thereto can be given without first understanding that difference.

During the long period of 323 years intervening between the erection at La Asunción (Baracoa) in 1518, of the episcopal see, which was transferred four years afterwards to Santiago de Cuba, and was the second See erected in the New World, the first having been that of La Española or Haiti, and the importation into Cuba of the novelties introduced into Spain under the influence of revolutionary ideas interfering with the Church, her ministers and her property, the condition of the Church in Cuba, as far as property and material resources are concerned, was one of independence and ease. The Church lived and flourished, securing as she did a glorious record out of her own revenue without assistance of any kind from the government.

That most important part of the organization of the Church which constitutes its main body and is represented by the secular clergy and their work depended for its support on revenues derived from the following sources:

(1) Tithes, originally a right to the tenth part of the product of lands, and stock upon lands, and subsequently a right to collect a pecuniary tax on the same at the rates and in the manner provided by law.

(2) "Capellanías" and "censos."

(3) Voluntary contributions, donations, legacies and pious funds and endowments.

The royal decree of September 9, 1842, took pains to explain, and the explanation is, therefore, authoritative, *interpretatio authentica,* that the obligation of the landowners to pay tithes was founded upon contract, and could therefore be enforced without resorting in the least to any consideration of religious duty. In corroboration of this doctrine the royal decree set forth that the concessions of land in Cuba had been granted by the Crown upon the express condition that tithes should be paid.

This doctrine of the Spanish Government has been, *de facto* at least, endorsed by its successor the Government of the United States, as it has continued to collect the tax in the same form and manner as Spain left it when giving up her sovereignty. There is, nevertheless, a great difference between what was done in this respect by the Spanish authorities and what is now done by the American. As will be seen hereafter much more in full, the Spaniards took possession of this revenue and made it a State revenue, but this was done on condition that the Church should be paid out of it a certain amount of money. The Americans have succeeded the Spaniards in the collection, use and enjoyment of the revenue; but the idea has not as yet occurred to them that they must also succeed their conquered foes in making the payments to which that revenue was previously devoted.

The other important part of the organization of the Church which constitutes that noble branch, so powerfully instrumental to the evangelization of the people and the diffusion of Catholic doctrine, practices and habits, and is represented by the religious or monastic orders, or, as it is said in Spanish, *El Clero Regular*, depended for its support on revenues of its own derived from the following sources:

(1) "Capellanías" and "censos," founded in favor of their respective houses or convents.

(2) Voluntary contributions in money or property, donations, legacies and pious funds and endowments of various classes.

The fact is well known that the monastic orders, whenever and wherever established, have always succeeded in securing a firm hold in the hearts of the people. The essentially democratic character of most of them and the unbounded religious zeal and charity characteristic of all have placed them at all times in close contact with the people and have allowed the work of the Church to be efficiently done, even in quarters which the secular clergy cannot easily reach. But in Cuba, where Franciscans, and Dominicans, and Augustinians, and Belemites, as well as the sons of St. John of God, and others, became so conspicuous from the very first days of the settlement of the country for their staunch defense of the rights of the people, for their uncompromising opposition to tyranny and cruelty, for their efforts to propagate public instruction, whether by teaching gratuitously in their own convents or by opening primary schools free to all, rich or poor, Spaniard or native, white or colored, and crowning the whole structure with the establishment of the Dominican Fathers of the University of Havana, as high in rank and efficiency as the highest in the world, and for their practical ardor, zeal and self-denial in ministering to the poor and the afflicted, by creating homes and asylums for the orphan, the destitute, the leper and the insane, hospitals for the sick and the convalescent and charitable institutions of all kinds, the attachment and love of the people to these orders was intensified to the extreme. The result was that almost from the very beginning the Cuban convents were placed by the people in a condition, if not of great wealth, at least of independence, which rendered all assistance on the part of the government entirely unnecessary.

But the wave of "reform" which had been raging in Spain ever since the importation into her territory of the principles and ideas of the French Revolution of 1789, and had culminated in the iniquitous drastic laws of 1837, succeeded in reaching Cuba in 1841, and caused the state of things just described to be changed completely. Had the "reform" been allowed to have full sway in the island, as it had had in the mother country, the harm done to the Cuban Church might perhaps have been irreparable. But Providence permitted that at the critical moment, owing to that strange power of the Governors General of Cuba—a power which in other respects has been so prolific of evil results—in the exercise of which they could suspend the execution of any law or order of whatever kind or description emanating from the home government which they, in their own discretion, might consider obnoxious or in opposition to the best interests of the Crown or of the people—*facultades omnimodas*—an obstacle was raised against which the whole movement was compelled to stop and then divide its force and mitigate its fury. Over three years were necessary to bring about a settlement. Noble work was then done in favor of the Church and the country by an eminent Cuban, Don Claudio Martinez de Pinillos, Count of Villanueva, who, through his talents and his merits, had succeeded in reaching the position which he held at that time, second only in importance to that of the Governor General, of Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury of Cuba. Through his efforts and those of many other distinguished officials, Cubans as well as Spaniards, the compromise which is known under the name of "the arrangements of 1841-1843" was made and accepted, and became for the time being the law of the country. These "arrangements" consisted in a series of measures by which the most odious and malignant features of the Spanish "reform" were wiped out, and the new *status* of apparent dependence of the Church upon the State was made take the place of the absolute and fully avowed independence which had formerly existed.

One of these compromise measures, the vital importance of which cannot be exaggerated, because it affects the main support of the secular clergy, from Diocesan to simple priest, was raised soon afterwards to the higher dignity of a formal enactment by means of a royal decree dated September 9, 1842, which, while providing that all former laws relating to tithes and turning them from a purely ecclesiastical revenue into a government revenue, should continue to be in force, temporarily, *interinamente*, directed that the government should thereafter pay to the Church, out of funds derived from the said tithes, which were to be primordially affected to meet this obligation, and if not sufficient, out of any other funds of its own not otherwise appropriated, whatever sums of money might be found to be necessary for the support of the secular clergy and the payment of the expenses of divine worship in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba and the Diocese of Havana, as estimated by a Board or *Junta*, which by the same royal decree was established. The government assumed this obligation towards the Church in compensation of the use of the Church revenue, which it assumed to collect and manage temporarily. *Con obligación*, the royal decree says, *de satisfacer las congruas y demás dotaciones que para la manutención del culto y clero de sus diócesis se estimaren necesarias por la Junta que al efecto se mandó crear por el artículo noveno.*

This arrangement, which as will be seen hereafter, was made permanent by royal cédula of September 30, 1852, created the condition of things which General Brooke found in the island of Cuba when, on the 1st of January, 1899, the Spanish flag was pulled down and the flag of the United States of America hoisted in its place at the Government's palace at Havana.

It was a situation of *do ut des*, or of *capio ut capias*—of contractual character, involving mutuality of relations and rights—in which the Government of the United States is bound to-day, as Spain was before, either to continue to pay the stipulated amounts or to return the revenue which had been seized and held upon the express condition that such payments should be made.

Another important "arrangement," subsequently ratified by a royal cédula issued on the 26th of November, 1852, and carried at once into effect with universal satisfaction of the Cuban people, was the one relating to the religious orders or monastic institutions of the island of Cuba. It consisted chiefly in excluding from the operation of the "reform" laws of Spain, for all effects and purposes, whether in relation to persons or to property, the communities of nuns and Sisters of whatever class, and in permitting said laws to be enforced with regard to the communities of monks and friars, only in a modified form, which, while preventing said communities from increasing their membership, either through novitiate or accession, and from managing and using the revenue lawfully derived from their property, allowed the said communities to remain in their convents, under the name of "Congregaciónes Religiosas," reduced to a fixed number of members, their personal expenses and the expenses of divine worship in their respective churches to be paid by the government.

With the exception, perhaps, of the magnificent Church of Saint Francis, in Havana, upon whose portal the inscription can yet be read: *Non est in toto sanctior orbe locus*, no other church was allowed to be closed to the public in the Diocese of Havana. The convent to which it was attached and the Convent of the Third Order of St. Francis, which formed part of the structure, the former being held sacred among some other things from the fact that St. Francis Solano had been for a time one of its inmates, were also the only ones which the government was allowed to retain completely. The Church, owing to its vast dimensions and to its situation on the very edge of the Havana harbor, was taken by the government for Custom House purposes, and the convents gave room to the general archives of the island, to some government offices and even to private lodgings for some favorite employés.

All other convents for men, even when partially taken by the government for public or official purposes, had a portion reserved to accommodate their former inmates, as members who were now of the "Congregación Religiosa" therein established. As to the church or chapel attached to the convent, it was left in the hands and under the care and control of the same "Congregación."

Each one of these communities was allowed to retain its own name, to live according to its own rule, to wear its own habit and to act in all outward respects as if nothing had been changed. But its respective membership could not exceed certain limits, and even the number of attendants or servants was fixed. The superior of each house became its "president." And if the number of friars existing in one convent was larger than the one which the "Congregación" was allowed to have, those forming the surplus were to have positions, if possible, in the secular clergy, as pastors of churches, etc., etc., with permission, however, to continue to wear, if they wanted, the habit of their order. If the number was found to be smaller, the lawful membership should be completed by bringing priests of other orders or, if practicable, of the secular clergy.

The "Congregaciónes" which General Brooke found in Cuba in 1899, and whose members are now laboring under circumstances of stress and poverty almost intolerable, were three in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba, namely, the United "Congregaciónes" of Franciscans of Bayamo and Santiago de Cuba, that of the Fathers of the Pious Schools (Escolapios) and that of the Fathers of La Merced; and nine in the Diocese of Havana, formed respectively by Carmelites, Franciscans, Paulists, Dominicans, Augustinians, Jesuits, Escolapios, Passionists and Trinitarians.

The personal expenses of these priests and those of the cult in their charge were to be met, and met, up to the time of the American occupation, out of the revenues derived by the government from the property belonging to each order, which the government was allowed to retain, in usufruct, but subject to that condition.

The salary of the president of each "Congregación" was $600 per year. That of each "congregado," $480. Sextons, attendants and servants had respectively from $240 to $180 per year.

The expenses of divine worship in these churches were met by a lump sum, varying from $1,200 to $5,180 a year, payable by monthly instalments. The reason of the difference was because those churches receiving more money had also to perform a greater number of religious duties, as otherwise certain donations and bequests made in their favor which the government was interested in keeping alive would have been forfeited.

This was the state of things which existed in Cuba when, on the 16th of March, 1851, a solemn Concordat was concluded between the Holy See and the Crown of Spain, and the provision of that compact, subsequently ratified and affirmed by the Convention of August 25, 1859, were made applicable to Cuba and all the other dominions of Spain. All the seizures of property belonging to the Church, whether made under the crude name of "confiscation" or under the disguised ones of "commutation," "permutation," "nationalization," or something else, were openly condemned and repudiated. Whatever property of this kind was found in the hands of the government was ordered to be returned to the Church, or to the respective diocesans in her behalf, "at once and without delay." Indemnification, to be paid in registered bonds of the three per cent. consolidated debt of Spain, was to be made for the property which had been destroyed or sold or which for some other reasons could not be easily returned. Justice was made at last, and peace, so long disturbed in Spain between the Church and the government, was finally restored and reëstablished.

The provisions of the Concordat, when tried to be enforced in Cuba, were met by an obstacle which was not easy to surmount. Owing to certain reasons, the enumeration of which is not necessary, the government did not deem it advisable—perhaps it was impossible for it to do it—to pay the Cuban Church with those three per cent. registered bonds of the consolidated debt the value of the property which had been taken away from her and could not be returned without great inconvenience.

It was no doubt very difficult to vacate the Church and Convent of St. Francis of Havana and leave the Custom House and the Archives and the other offices established in those large and magnificent buildings entirely homeless. It was not an easy thing to dislodge the University, the Museum, the Public Library and other Government institutions, which had been accommodated with decent quarters in portions of other convents. It was also very difficult, if not at all impossible, for the government to command at that time, after the operations of the same kind made in Spain, such a number of bonds as were required to pay the Cuban Church the proper indemnity. Perhaps it was deemed better to leave Cuba and the Cuban people entirely unconnected with the Spanish consolidated debt. Be it as it may, the fact is that the government, while carrying into effect, in its spirit as well as in its letter, in the island of Cuba the provisions of the Concordat, thought it necessary to do so by means of certain orders of local application calculated to remove or obviate whatever difficulties might present themselves.

The first measure of this kind was the Royal Cédula, or ordinance, of September 30, 1852, relating to tithes. It was provided by it, (1) that the arrangements made or approved by the royal decree of September 9, 1842, above referred to should be maintained and continued, or, in other words, that the government should continue to collect and use the tithes revenue, but on condition to pay the Church certain stipulated amounts; (2) that out of the moneys derived from that source by the government or, if not sufficient, out of any other moneys in the Treasury of Cuba not otherwise appropriated, the salaries of $18,000 per year each should be paid to the Right Rev. Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba and to the Right Rev. Bishop of Havana, both Prelates to have besides, until some other final arrangements could be made, $1,000 the former and $4,000 the latter, to pay house rents; (3) that out of the same sources salaries, ranking from $4,500 to $2,000 a year, should be paid the Deans and other members of the respective Cathedral chapters; (4) that all laws and decrees abridging or interfering with the right of the respective Archbishop and Bishop to dispose by will or otherwise of their own property or levying upon those Prelates any kind of extra burden or taxation should be at once invalidated and repealed; (5) that the same system of classification of parishes as had been adopted in Spain, dividing them into three classes called respectively *de ingreso* (entrance or admission in the pastorate), *de ascenso* (promotion or elevation in rank) and *de término* (end or completion of the career), with salaries of $700, $1,200 and $2,000 a year, should be adopted in Cuba; (6) that in Cuba, the same as in Spain, the fees collected by the curates for baptisms, marriages, etc., should be divided into two parts, one of them to be used for what is called *la fábrica*, that is to say, repairs of the church building and other expenses of that kind, and the other to go to the curate himself, but to be imputed and charged to his salary account; (7) that the sums of $300, $400 and $700 a year should be paid to each church, according to its respective category, to attend with it to the expenses of divine worship; and finally (8) that some other arrangements to complete what was called the "putting of the secular branch of the Church on a firm and stable foundation," arrangements which the royal cédula minutely describes, should be carried at once into effect.

The second measure came out in the shape of another Royal Cédula or ordinance of the same date, and related especially to the Seminary of each Cathedral, to the Cathedrals themselves and to some matters of detail which had been omitted in the preceding enactment.

The third measure was also a Royal Cédula, bearing the same date, in which the ecclesiastical division of the island was carried into effect, the names of each parish, whether *de ingreso, de ascenso* or *de término,* in each diocese, being given in full.

The fourth measure, in the shape of another Royal Cédula or ordinance, dated November 26, 1852, referred to the religious orders, and after paying to them a great and well deserved tribute, and reiterating that under Article 38 of the Concordat all the property belonging to them held by the government and not sold *should be at once released and restored to them or to the respective diocesans in their behalf*, provided (Article 5) that, "in compliance with such a solemn promise," the Governor General of Cuba, "with the advice of the Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury and the proper intervention of the respective Diocesans, should proceed at once to form an inventory of all the "censos," houses, lands and other property, real, personal or mixed, belonging to the religious communities and not sold or disposed of," . . . and that "as soon as this inventory is made the formal obligation should be entered in writing by the Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury, in my Royal name, in favor of the Church as represented by the respective Archbishop or Bishop, to set aside the proceeds of the said property to satisfy the necessities of the Church and to attend, preferently to all other things, to the maintenance and support of the religious houses to which the Cédula refers." *Se extiènda* **por el Superintendente** *en mi Real nombre obligación formal á favor de la Iglesia y en su representación de los respectivos Diocesanos . . . de invertir sus productos en sus necesidades y con preferencia en la manutención y sostenimiento de los institutos religiosos a que se contrae la presente Cédula.*

These religious houses were those of the Paulists (the Spanish Paulists or clergymen of St. Vincent of Paul, clerigos de San Vicente de Paula) the Escolapios, the Jesuits and the Franciscans. The other orders which, in the shape of "Congregaciónes religiosas," had survived the "reform" were, of course, respected and allowed to continue their work without hindrance.

During the forty-seven years elapsed between the dates of these Royal Cédulas, which might be called the fundamental charter of the modern Church of Cuba, and the 1st of January, 1899, when General Brooke took up his official residence at the palace of the Governors General of Cuba, no substantial alteration was made to the provisions just described. Some orders were transferred from one convent to another, when in the opinion of the Diocesan such a transfer was necessary. The Augustinians, who were few in number, were, as it might be said, concentrated in the building belonging to their Third Order; and the Franciscans, who were more numerous and who, according to the Royal Cédula of November 26, 1852, were to be given preferent recognition, not as a single "congregación," but as a regular monastic order, were given the main convent of St. Augustin. Some other minor changes took place. But the principle was always maintained that the property of the Church which was held by the government was property of the Church, and that whatever money was paid to the Church by the government was money of the Church derived from property retained by the government in usufruct, and when practicable under inventory, the title on which had never been divested from the Church.

The present Governor of Cuba, Major General Leonardo Wood, when speaking about the provinces of Santiago de Cuba and Puerto Principe in his special report of October 5, 1899, above cited, explained the situation as follows:

"The property of the Catholic Church, as formerly established in Cuba, was held by the Spanish Government as a part of the property of the State, the administration of public worship being considered a part of the duty of the government in consideration of the surrender to the State of such ecclesiastical properties.

"The government charged itself with the payment of all the expenses of religion and public worship, including the salaries of the clergy. On the withdrawal of Spain from the island these payments, of course, ceased to be made.

"It is now claimed on behalf of the ecclesiastical authorities that the properties used for religious purposes should revert to the possession and ownership of the Church by reason of the failure of the Spanish Government to meet or to fulfill the obligations contracted when these properties passed into the possession of the State.

"On the other hand, it is claimed by some of the representative Cubans that the Church property may be regarded as any other public property, the Church having parted with all claims to ownership or use when the property was surrendered to the government.

"Pending a settlement of this question by competent authority, the ecclesiastical authorities remain in possession of the churches and worship is held in them, the expenses being defrayed by the voluntary contributions of the worshipers." With the exception of some slight inaccuracies, this presentation of the case is fair.

It is inaccurate to say, for instance, that the property of the Church held by the government in Cuba was held *as part of the property of the State*, because, as it has been shown by the Concordat and by the Royal Cédula of 1852, it was held as *property of the Church*, was managed and administered as such, under inventory, and by a special branch of the government organization, and was specially affected, preferently, if not exclusively, to the payment of the expenses of religion and worship.

It is also inaccurate to say or intimate that Spain ever failed to meet or to fulfill the obligations contracted when these properties passed into the possession of the State. The truth is that that failure is chargeable alone to the American authorities, which stopped at once the payments without stopping simultaneously the possession of the property and the enjoyment of the proceeds.

But the distinguished soldier and statesman upon whom the destinies of Cuba are now practically depending was fair enough to avoid taking sides with "the representative Cubans" to whom he alludes, and recognized without difficulty that an important question is involved in this matter and that that question has to be settled, if not settled arbitrarily, by competent authority.

It is unnecessary to say that the allegation of those "representative Cubans" that the Church parted with all claims to ownership or use of property when the government took possession of it has no foundation at all, either in fact or in law. In fact, because it is clear, as abundantly shown by the record, that the Church never made that parting, and that the government, after having repudiated and repealed and condemned all attempts to confiscate the Church property, ordered it to be returned to the Church. The State was not permitted to retain it, except when the restitution was attended with difficulties, and the retention was then to be merely in usufruct, and subject to the obligations which have been explained. In law, because it is well known, and nobody can doubt it, if versed in these matters, that the Church cannot part with the ownership of the property of churches and convents or of pious funds and endowments specially created for religious purposes.

It is to be expected that the Government of the United States will see without difficulty, that it is its plain duty to release and return to the Church, through the respective Archbishop and Bishop, every piece of property belonging to the Church in Cuba, which was transmitted to it by the Spanish Government, and to pay, furthermore, such indemnification as may be found to be proper for the use of that property since it fell into its hands.

It is also to be expected that the Government of the United States, being true to its word, will not allow any property rights or any rights of any other kind belonging to the Church in Cuba to be impaired, either by its own officials or by the Cuban authorities, on the pretext that the relinquishment of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba has operated changes which would be in conflict with and in opposition to the provisions of Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace: that it will practically *secure* the free exercise in the island of the Catholic religion; and that when the day comes, if ever, for the United States to leave Cuba to herself, it will impress efficiently upon the Cuban Government that the obligations contracted by the United States before the civilized world in regard to the religion and the Church of the island must be, to the credit of all the parties concerned, literally and strictly respected.

J. I. RODRIGUEZ.

Washington.

WAS ST. PAUL IN SPAIN?

IN connection with our recent war it is interesting to know, in general, something of the origin of Christianity in Spain; in particular, just how probably St. Paul carried his teachings to the homes of the silver miners and grape growers of that historic land. On what grounds do such church historians as Pearson, Hug, Olshausen,[1] Neander,[2] Fleury,[3] Darras,[4] Hergenroether,[5] Renan,[6] Bunsen,[7] Conybeare and Howson[8] base their belief that St. Paul made a Spanish journey, while Baur, Wieseler, Schenkel and Schaff either doubt or deny it altogether?[9]

It is our purpose briefly to state two explicit and as many implicit proofs, with the views of competent critics, about this subject. In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (ch. xv., v. 24) it is said: "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that as I pass I shall see you and be brought on my way thither by you." Did he go?

Again, in the Acts (ch. xxviii., vs. 16 and 30), we read that St. Paul came to Rome. Bleek, commenting on this, says: "We may therefore regard it as certain that St. Paul really did labor in the parts referred to (*i. e.*, Spain), for the Acts were surely written some years after the Apostle's second year in Rome, and the way they end hints not of his martyrdom, which should have been mentioned, but rather of his liberation."[10]

So from the inspired writings, St. Paul, above all things a man of determination and untiring physical as well as mental energy, intended to go to Spain; and, moreover, there is no denial of his going. Such being the state of the question, is there no competent and trustworthy witness to fill out the unfinished accounts in the Epistle to the Romans and in the Acts of the Apostles?

I. St. Clement,[11] third Bishop of Rome after St. Peter, who wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians not later than the end of the first century, is such a character. Living at Rome, probably a disciple of St. Paul, and acquainted with St. Paul's projects, he writes that his master "preached the Gospel in the east and in the west . . . had instructed the whole world" [*i. e.*, Roman], and had gone to "the extremities of the West" (*τα τερμα της δυσεω*).[12]

---

[1] Schaff's "Apostolic Church," p. 398. [2] "General Church History," Vol. I., p. 116. [3] "Histoire de l'Eglise," liv. II., § 10. [4] "General Hist. of the Church," Vol. I., p. 47. [5] "Histoire de l'Eglise," Vol. II., p. 197, ed. 94. [6] "L'Anti-Christ," p. 106. [7] "Hippolytus," I., p. 27, second edition. [8] "St. Paul," p. 802, popular edition. [9] Schaff's "Apostolic Church," p. 398. [10] "Introduction to N. T.," Vol. II., p. 60. [11] Though some deny C. of Phil. iv., 3 is C. Romanus, yet all admit the epistle was written in the first century. [12] I. Epis. to Cor., ch. v.

If any commentary on these words be asked Lightfoot should stand first. "In the Epistle to the Romans (xv., 24) S. Paul had stated his intention of visiting Spain. From the language of Clement here it appears that this intention was fulfilled. . . . But it is incredible that a writer living in the metropolis and centre of power and civilization could speak of it as 'the extreme west,' and this at a time when many eminent Latin authors and statesmen were or had been natives of Spain, and when the commercial and passenger traffic with Gades was intimate and constant."[13]

Bunsen says: "It appears to me very arbitrary to deny a fact for which we have the explicit evidence of Paul's disciple and companion, Clemens."[14]

Conybeare and Howson, in their "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," say: "In a Roman author the 'extremity of the west' could mean nothing short of Spain."[15]

And Neander adds: "Since the Roman Bishop Clemens says that St. Paul went to the very boundaries of the west, we cannot imagine this expression to allude to Rome, and our thoughts naturally turn to Spain. Clement was probably himself the disciple of St. Paul, and this is a matter on which we can hardly suppose him to have been deceived!"[16]

Conybeare and Howson admit that: "Against this unanimous testimony of the primitive Church there is no external evidence whatever to oppose."[17]

Despite these fair and able critics, Schaff contends that: "As Clement wrote to the Corinthians he may, from their geographical standpoint, have called the Roman capital the end of the west."[18] But from the citations above it is clear that the burden of the criticism of St. Clement's *τα τερμα της δυσεως* is decidedly on the side of St. Paul's having gone to Spain.

II. A century and a half ago the learned Italian Muratori printed his "Antiquitates Italicæ," containing, amongst other things, a manuscript of the ninth century. In this old manuscript was imbedded a fragment of a manuscript written some time between the year 160[19] and 190.[20] In the thirty-ninth of its eighty-five lines it speaks of "Paul's setting out from the city [of Rome] for Spain." Schaff quibblingly says: "This is merely a conjecture, as the verb *omittit* has to be supplied."[21] But evidently the substantial sense is clearly something about the *fact* of Paul's setting out for Spain. So that this seems truly a second though less clinching explicit testimony in favor of Paul's going to Spain.

Every student of Church History highly values and dearly loves the "pater familias" of all Church historians—Eusebius of Cæsarea, by far the most learned man of his age, every inch an historian and a lover of the olden days and matters of fact. In the twenty-second chapter of the second book of his Church History we read: "Thus, after he had made his defense, it is said that the Apostle was sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and that upon coming to the same city a second time he suffered martyrdom."

---

[13] Corinthians ch. v., note 6. [14] "Hippolytus," second edition, Vol. I., p. 127. [15] Page 801. [16] Neander's "Hist. of First Three Centuries of Church," pp. 49-50. [17] "St. Pau'," p. 802. [18] Schaff's "Gen. Ch. Hist.," I., p. 332. [19] Westcott. [20] Muratori. [21] Schaff's C. C., I. p. 333.

This apparent proof of Paul's freedom after his two years in Rome and, therefore, of his easy chance of fulfilling his purpose of going to Spain, is criticized rather severely by Neander: "The tradition in Eusebius is not sufficient evidence, because it was then too much the fashion to establish facts from incompetent presumptions, conclusions and suppositions, and so perhaps Romans xv., 24 may have given rise to this report."[22] But although Eusebius did write two hundred and fifty years after the event, and although his words are vague (λογος εχει), and although contrary to his custom —he quotes no authority, yet his testimony gains a consideration with many, and offers a third though indirect and less cogent proof of Paul's journey to Spain.

"The best proof of this concluding [missionary] work are the pastoral epistles.[23] It is now admitted by nearly all those who are competent to decide on such a question, first, that the historical facts mentioned in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus cannot be placed in any portion of St. Paul's life before or during his first imprisonment in Rome, and, secondly, that the style in which those epistles are written and the condition of the Church described in them forbid the supposition of such a date."[24] Moreover, it is now conceded that in the first Christian century there were many Jews in Spain, and consequently St. Paul would wish to reach them with his good news formerly told in the Areopagus of Greece.

That Gelasius says Paul was not able to go to Spain *for a certain time* we admit; but he is one witness, and a late one, against many like Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret and Jerome, who say he *did* go.

That Innocent I. is another who says that "None of the Apostles but Peter taught the faith in Spain and the west" we admit; but the common belief, even when Innocent wrote this, was in favor of Paul's having been in Spain. Or, again, Innocent may have forgotten or overlooked Paul, or used "Apostles" in the sense of the first and original *twelve*, excluding Paul.

That if Paul were in Spain we should hear of it in his works needs no refutation, for much of Paul's labors are undescribed; while we have nothing at all told us in Scripture of the late labors of many of the Apostles.

---

[22] "History of Christian Religion and Church During First Three Centuries," p. 49.

[23] Schaff's "Gen. Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., p. 333.

[24] Conybeare and Howson, op. cit., p. 803.

That there is no Church of St. Paul in Spain claiming foundation by Paul has, if substantiated, some weight as an objection. However, even Schaff concedes: "These post-apostolic testimonies, taken together, make it very probable, but not historically certain, that Paul was released after the spring of 63."[25] And Conybeare and Howson say in conclusion that: "The evidence on this subject, though not copious, is yet conclusive as far as it goes, and it is all one way."[26] Therefore, it seems that in this much-mooted and still unsettled question the probability is that the great Apostle of the Gentiles really did not stop his missionary labors till he reached the border lands of the wild Atlantic, *τα τερμα της δυσεως* of the pre-Columbian world.

Louis O'Donovan.

Petersville, Md.

Scientific Chronicle.

TOTAL ECLIPSE OF THE SUN MAY 28, 1900.

The total eclipse of the sun, which will occur on May 28, is of more than usual interest to the people of the United States, because the shadow path of totality runs most conveniently across the East Gulf and Middle Atlantic States. The path of the eclipse enters the United States at New Orleans, La., and runs in a northeast direction, leaving the States at Norfolk, Va. Thus such cities as New Orleans, La., Mobile, Ala., Montgomery, Ala., Raleigh, N. C., and Norfolk, Va., besides very many small towns, lie well within the path of totality. Thousands of persons may thus view this eclipse, if the weather be favorable, without making long journeys to do so.

In the United States the eclipse occurs during the morning hours, beginning at New Orleans at about twenty minutes past 7, and ending at Norfolk about 9 o'clock. All along the line of the eclipse the totality, or the time that the sun is totally obscured, is of short duration. In a solar eclipse totality may last five or six minutes, but such eclipses are of rare occurrence. In the present case totality lasts from 1 minute 13 seconds to 1 minute 42 seconds. The shortest duration corresponds with the entrance of the shadow at New Orleans, and the duration increases as the shadow moves eastward until it reaches its maximum in the United States at Norfolk. As seconds are precious on such occasions, observers who wish to obtain all the data they can from this eclipse will locate their stations as far eastward as possible. To enable observers to locate their stations where the weather conditions will in all probability be most favorable, the United States Department of Agriculture has issued as a bulletin of the Weather Bureau, a pamphlet by Mr. Frank H. Bigelow, giving the results of observations made during the last three years at from sixty-six to eighty-eight stations along the path of the eclipse in the United States. The object of the observations was to determine the prevailing average cloudiness in the districts covered by the path of the eclipse. The observations were made at each station between 8 and 9 o'clock in the morning, the time at which the eclipse will occur.

---

[25] Schaff's op. cit., I. p. 333.

[26] Conybeare and Howson, op. cit., p. 800.

These observations were two-fold, first on the general state of the sky and secondly on the state of the sky near the sun. At first sight it might appear that the low altitude of the sun at the time of the eclipse would indicate an unfavorable position for observation on account of mist or clouds along the horizon. When, however, the results of the observations were summed up and reduced for comparison it was found that in the second case, the sky near the sun, the percentages for cloudiness ran smaller than in the case of the general condition of the sky. This shows that in the Southern States the position of the sun at the time of the eclipse is more likely to be clear at that hour than the rest of the sky. Another conclusion arrived at from the discussion of the observations of 1899 is that the percentages show a decrease of cloudiness from the Atlantic coast near Norfolk, Va., toward Georgia, and also from the Gulf coast at New Orelans, La., toward the same point. From which it is concluded that Eastern Alabama and Central Georgia, about south of Atlanta, is the most favorable region for avoiding the tendency to cloudiness. Here, then, is the best place to locate the eclipse stations as far as this consideration is concerned. The report of the Weather Bureau already referred to is most painstaking and will prove of great value to the number of scientists who are preparing to observe the coming eclipse.

A total solar eclipse gives an opportunity of making a number of interesting and important observations. The observation of the times of the four contacts of the sun and moon, which serve to correct the tables of their motions. Then there are telescopic and spectroscopic observations of the corona and prominences and the photographing of the same. In addition there will no doubt be a sharp lookout for intra-mercurial planets. To the ordinary observer so situated as to command a view of the distant western horizon the approach of the moon's shadow is a most interesting spectacle. It advances like a thunder-storm with surprising swiftness. The moon advances along its orbit at the rate of about 2,100 miles per hour. This would be the rate at which the shadow would travel if the earth did not rotate on its axis. The earth is rotating eastward in the same general direction as that in which the shadow is moving. At the equator the surface of the earth moves at the rate of about 1,040 miles per hour. This reduces the speed of the shadow to about 1,060 miles per hour. In higher latitudes, where the velocity of the earth's rotation is smaller, the speed of the shadow is higher. In the present case the velocity will be about 1,300 miles per hour.

Should the weather conditions prove favorable we may expect good results from the observations made during the coming solar eclipse.

DAVID E. HUGHES, F. R. S.

The death of David E. Hughes, which occurred on January 22 last, removes a well-known figure from the scientific field. A short notice of Professor Hughes will be of interest to our readers, since his first great work was brought out in America. He was of Welsh descent and was born in London on May 16, 1831. When he was seven years old his father emigrated to the United States and settled as a planter in Virginia. When the boy grew up he became a citizen of the United States. He never abandoned his citizenship, and this, according to a notice of his death in *Nature*, is probably the reason why the English Government never recognized his eminent scientific services. The boy early developed a talent for music, and at the age of 19 was appointed professor of music in the Presbyterian Academy, Bardstown, Ky. Shortly afterwards he was appointed to the chair of natural philosophy in the same institution.

This was a period of rapid telegraphic development, and Hughes became interested in the nascent art. At the age of 24 he invented his celebrated Roman type-printing telegraph, which was first patented in this country in 1855. In the hands of such men as Peter Cooper and Cyrus Field it soon went into practical use, passing ultimately into the control of the Western Union Telegraph Company. His instrument was based on synchronism, and each letter was struck by one current.

He went to England in 1857 to introduce his apparatus. The time was not favorable, as the telegraph was in the hands of private companies and their capital was locked up in promoting other patents. In 1860 his system was adopted in France, and he was made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. Similar honors were conferred on him in Italy, Russia, Austria, Turkey, Bavaria, Wurtemburg and Spain. The system was adopted in these countries as well as in England, Prussia and Switzerland.

For an interesting account of Professor Hughes' early days when he was engaged on his first great invention, the writer is indebted to Rev. Walter Hill, S. J. It is in the subjoined letter of Mr. J. W. Muir, vice president of the banking house of Wilson & Muir, Bardstown, Ky., to Father Hill:

"I knew Hughes well. He boarded in the same house I did. I was frequently in his room with him during his leisure hours, when he was engaged at his invention. He taught music on the harp at the Bardstown Presbyterian Academy. He was regarded as a brilliant performer on that instrument and a fine teacher. Hughes was a very diminutive man in his physical proportions, but of wonderful energy. He had in his room the works of an old brass clock, to which he attached a small wooden cylinder, into which with the aid of his penknife and a small chisel, he inserted ordinary printing type. This cylinder was made to revolve, and by means of keys worked by the fingers he would print whatever he wished on slips of paper passing under the type. His companion at this time was Mr. Hast, a German, who gave music lessons on the piano. The two boarded at the same house and ran their instruments late into the night, much to the discomfort of the other boarders. Hughes was then a poor young man, but said that although he was so small in physical build he would yet astonish the world and live in history. I met him afterwards on the streets of Louisville, and he told me that he had a medal from Napoleon III. as a reward for his printing telegraph."

The adoption of his instruments in every country in Europe brought him honor and wealth. Being a man of simple habits and of few wants, his expenditure was small, but his income great. According to published reports he has been most generous in endowing various scientific institutions and hospitals with large sums of money.

In 1879 Professor Hughes brought out the microphone. The same year he showed how to eliminate the effects of mutual induction from lateral wires by twisting the wires around each other in a metalic circuit. This was followed by the induction balance and a series of researches in magnetism and inductance.

Some of our Catholic papers have announced lately that Professor Hughes was a Catholic and a priest; that he taught music in St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, and that afterwards he was appointed to the chair of natural sciences in the same institution. All this is stated without giving a single authority by which the truth of the statements might be verified. The statement that he taught at St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, is not true. This is asserted on the authority of Rev. Walter Hill, S. J., who was stationed at St. Joseph's at the time young Hughes was at Bardstown. Father Hill writes: "The Mr. Hast mentioned in Mr. Muir's letter was a Catholic and came with his brother to the college frequently to play music with Father Miles and myself. Had Hughes been a Catholic he would undoubtedly have come to the college with his companion to meet the musical experts found there. This he never did to my knowledge."

Mr. Muir, whom we have already quoted, again writes: "I have no reason to believe that when Mr. Hughes resided in Bardstown he belonged to any denomination of Christians. He was a man of fine moral character and demeaned himself as a high gentleman." The funeral service over the remains was conducted according to the ritual of the Church of England.

Professor Hughes was not a mathematician, nor was he deeply versed in scientific literature. He jumped by intuition to facts which he was most ingenious in verifying by means of the most ordinary appliances. Pill boxes, nails, sealing wax, knitting needles, tumblers, old cans and cheap copper formed quite a sufficient outfit for him. His success in his chosen field is a bright example of what can be achieved by talent well and patiently directed. As he determined when a poor lad at Bardstown, he will live in the history of science.

THE CATALYTIC PROCESS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF SULPHURIC ACID.

In the whole range of chemical manufacture the most important branch is the production of sulphuric acid. Sulphuric acid is as necessary for the chemical industries as iron for the mechanical. So great is the demand for this acid that it is claimed that the annual consumption of this acid is a good indication of the material prosperity of a country. A mere mention of a few of the uses of sulphuric acid will show that this claim is well founded. It is used in refining petroleum, and it is estimated that 90 per cent. of the acid manufactured in the United States is used for this purpose. It is consumed in large quantities in making acid phosphate of lime for fertilizing purposes. The storage battery business consumes yearly large quantities of it, while the drug and chemical trade demand a great amount of it. The nitroglycerin and nitrocellulose industries demand a good concentrated sulphuric acid. This short and very incomplete enumeration will suffice to give some idea of the extensive use of sulphuric acid.

The old process of manufacturing sulphuric acid is known as the "chamber process." It consists, first, in burning in a suitable furnace either crude sulphur or sulphide ores, such as iron pyrites, so as to form sulphurous anhydride, a gas made up of one atom of sulphur to two of oxygen. A large excess of air is mixed with this gas, and the mixture is fed in a constant stream into a chamber lined with lava or chemical brick, substances not acted upon by the acid. This chamber is filled with closely packed pieces of similar material or quartz. The mixture passes up through this packing and many impurities brought over from the furnace are mechanically removed and the mixture is cooled. At the top of this chamber or tower a supply of nitrous anhydride, a gas containing nitrogen and oxygen in the proportion of 2 to 3, is given the mixture and the chemical process begins. The nitrous anhydride gives some of its oxygen to the sulphurous anhydride, converting it into a mixture of sulphur and oxygen in the proportion of 1 to 3. Just as this action begins the gases are carried into the first of a series of large leaden chambers, into which jets of steam are blowing to keep up the action just begun. These chambers are kept as cool as possible, and in them the steam, which is a vapor containing hydrogen and oxygen in the proportion of 2 to 1, unites with the compound of sulphur just mentioned and gives a new compound made up of hydrogen, sulphur and oxygen in the proportion 2, 1 and 4. This compound is sulphuric acid, which forms as a mist in the chamber and condensing on the walls flows to the floor, whence it is drawn off. The air in the operation is taxed to keep up the supply of oxygen that replenishes the nitrous anhydride for the part it plays, which was already referred to. The operation is usually carried on in a series of three chambers, but the acid as it comes from these chambers is quite dilute and must be drawn off into lead and costly platinum pans, where the water is driven off and the acid obtained in its strong or concentrated condition.

The new process does away with the cumbersome lead chambers and also with nitrous fumes as oxygen carriers. This is done by the use of the catalytic power of platinum or ferric oxide or other substance that has that power. By catalysis is meant that peculiar influence by which certain substances, without undergoing any apparent change themselves, help to resolve other substances in contact with it into new compounds. This is often termed the action of presence. This reaction was known as far back as 1831, as appears from a British patent granted in that year to Phillips. It was, however, principally worked out by German chemists such as Dobereiner, Magnus, Wholer, Plattner, Clemens, Winkler, Messel and others. Its application, however, seems not to have extended beyond the preparation of Nordhausen fuming acid. Now, however, comes the news that the process has been applied to the manufacture of ordinary sulphuric acid, and that the price is so cheap that the old lead chambers are disappearing and that the new process is supplanting the old.

The keystone of the new process is the fact that sulphurous anhydride, or SO_2 gas, combines readily with oxygen to form sulphuric anhydride, or SO_3 gas, when the mixture is passed at the proper temperature over a contact substance such as platinum black. There is a drawback just here which had to be overcome in the new process. The combination of these two gases generates a great amount of heat, and the new gas is broken up into the two gases that form it at a temperature not much in excess of that at which it was formed.

The generation of heat by the union of gases in the presence of a contact substance is illustrated by a simple experiment. Light an ordinary Bunsen burner and heat a small spiral of platinum wire in it for a few seconds. Then turn off the gas. When the platinum is cool—and it takes only a few seconds—turn on the gas again, holding the cold platinum in the current of gas. The gas and the oxygen of the air meeting at the platinum combine and the heat of the combination is sufficient to raise the platinum to incandescence and ignite the gas. This is the same principle as that applied in the Dobereiner hydrogen lamp.

This excessive heat, in the first step in the manufacture of sulphuric acid, is removed from the contact substance and the apparatus by means of external cooling. The gases as they come from the furnace are first purified, washed and dried according to common methods and raised to the temperature at which the chemical action begins. The gas is then forced into the contact tube. This tube contains the contact mass, which consists of some inert substance which is coated with platinum in a finely divided state, distributed in thin layers resting on perforated plates arranged in layers one above the other in such a way that the gas is forced to pass through the contact mass. This part of the apparatus is kept cool by the circulation of a current of cool air or furnace gas. Liquid baths may also be used. The most economical way is to use the gases themselves, which while cooling the contact tube are raised to the proper temperature for the chemical action. This cooling action prevents the breaking up of the sulphuric anhydride formed by the union of the sulphurous anhydride and the oxygen in the presence of the contact substance. The cooling must be regulated, for too low a temperature would prevent the union of the two last mentioned gases. This is usually done by regulating the temperature or the velocity of the cooling gas. The sulphuric anhydride thus formed passes into a chamber, where it is absorbed by concentrated sulphuric acid, the fuming acid thus formed being afterwards diluted to the required strength.

The development of the new process to its present stage of commercial success seems to be due to the untiring efforts, during the last ten years, of the Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik Company of Germany. Their methods are covered by patents. Patents have also been granted in England to the Farbwerke vormals Meister, Lucius und Bruning, of Hoechst-am-Main. The Elberfelder Farben Fabriken Company after investigation have installed a plant for the new process. It is said that these three concerns are among the largest, the most wealthy and most progressive concerns in the world. This is an argument in favor of the new process. They would not in all probability adopt a method which was not a commercial success. It is reported that these three companies together employ about five hundred chemists on experimental work.

The interesting question at present is whether in this country the new process will supplant the old. It is admitted by all that for weak acids, up to say 63 per cent. of sulphuric acid, the chamber process is as cheap as the new process. When, however, strength and purity are required the catalytic process is by far the most economical. We cannot expect the new process to be introduced except by new firms who intend to install new plants. The old firms, especially as the price of acid is high, will be deterred by the cost of the new installation and the royalties that must be paid.

The use of oxygen in a more concentrated form than it is found in ordinary atmospheric air may still further improve the process. Here, then, we may find a new field for liquid air. The improvement in the manufacture of sulphuric acid is already a great advance, but the development that it may occasion in other branches can only be conjectured.

LAKE NICARAGUA.

While our lawmakers are discussing the importance of building the Nicaraguan Canal as a matter of national policy, scientists are interested in the matter from another standpoint, namely, the assumed inconstancy in the level of Lake Nicaragua. This lake is the source of the San Juan river, and is intended as the feeder of the proposed canal. The determination and regulation of its level is then of vital importance to the success of the canal.

The foundation on which the assumed inconstancy is based is the observed fluctuations of the level, together with the great variety in the figures given for the level in the surveys of different competent and trustworthy engineers. In 1781 the Spanish engineer Galisteo found the level of the lake to be 133.11 feet above low water on the Pacific side. From the same level Lieutenant Baily in 1838 measured 128 feet 3 inches to the level of the lake. Colonel Childs in 1851 determined the altitude above Pacific low tide to be 111 feet 5 inches. Commander Hull in 1873 gave for the altitude of the lake 102.28. Colonel Childs puts the fluctuation in level at not more than five feet. The Nicaragua Canal Board increase the range of variation to 14 feet, and this at not distant intervals. Other surveys show like fluctuations in the level of the lake and a growing tendency to maintain the lower levels.

Descriptions of the Estero Panaloya, the northwestern termination of the lake, suggest an actual lowering of the lake level. At the time of the Baily survey and in 1849, when Squier made his plan for a canal, the Estero was open to free navigation with from 5 to 15 feet of water in it. Colonel Ludlow in his report states that in the dry season at least the channel of the Estero is also dry. Changes in the height of the San Juan river also point to a varying supply of water from the lake, just what would be expected from fluctuations in its level. In 1850 Squier compared this river to the Hudson and the Connecticut, saying that for most of its course it was capable of being navigated by our largest river steamers. Of this same stream Collinson, an English engineer, says, in a report made to the Royal Geographical Society in 1867, that the water was so low that small stern-wheelers drawing only ten inches of water could hardly grope their way along it.

There seems to be a change of level of such amount that it must be attributed to something more than the ordinary changes in rainfall from year to year, although these are very great. The change in level was attested by Collinson, and in the report above referred to he suggests an explanation which may be the true one. He says it may be due to an increased draining of the lake due to a differential rise or tilting of the land surface, which would increase the gradients of the river, and thus creating a more rapid flow of water would reduce the level of the lake. Whether this be true or not, it is clear that the lake is situated in a volcanic region, where such changes in land elevation are known to occur, and this lends some probability to the explanation. It seems certain that the level of the lake is inconstant, and it is more readily believed that the level of the lake has dropped 15 to 20 feet in little more than half a century than to admit that the numerous surveys were inaccurate. This question is a vital one, and must be taken into consideration in the discussion of the feasibility of the canal.

THE CANALS OF NEW YORK.

Among valuable engineering documents the report of the committee on the canals of New York, lately presented to Governor Roosevelt, will long hold an important place. A good idea of it may be formed from the abstracts given in the *Engineering News* and in the *Engineering Record.* The conclusions reached are of interest to those who remember all that the magazines and the papers, both daily and scientific, published not long ago about building a ship canal through New York State so that ocean-going vessels might, on reaching New York, proceed at once to the Great Lakes and receive their cargo at once without the necessity of reshipment at the seaport, which the use of a barge at present necessitates.

The first point considered by the committee is one that concerns the very existence of the canal as a means of transport. If the railroads can ever transport grain, coal, lumber and such like freight at a rate lower than is possible by means of a canal, then the latter will surely be abandoned. This is a question into which the committee went, with the following result: The present rate of transportation for such freight across the ocean is half a mill per ton-mile. On the lakes, where the vessels are smaller and the waterway restricted at places so as frequently to cause congestion of traffic, the rate is slightly higher, amounting to 0.6 of a mill. The canal rates under present conditions, namely, size of the canal and of the locks and of the use of animal power, which is the only power employed at present on the Erie Canal, amount to 2 mills per ton-mile. The ocean traffic is the same, whether the freight be brought to the seaport by rail or by the present method. So the competition is between the railroads on the one side and the lakes and canal on the other. If the length of the waterway of the lakes was just equal to the length of the canal, the rate for transportation by water under the present system, from the figures given above, would be 1.3 mills per ton-mile. The lake route is, however, much longer, and hence the rate is much lower than that given. This practically means that if the railroads wish to supplant the canal they must come down to a rate of 1 mill per ton-mile. A general enquiry into present railway freight rates as well as special information obtained from the presidents of three of the main roads which handle such freight, show that there is no probability of a rate of 1 mill per ton-mile, but, on the contrary, there is every indication that the rates will be higher. Hence under present conditions, even the waterway can hold its own against the railroads.

But the prospect is still brighter for the waterway if the suggestions of the committee are followed. They are as follows: That all restrictions upon the capitalization of canal transportation be removed; that mechanical traction be introduced instead of the present animal power, and that the locks and lifts be operated by new and approved mechanical means. It is also suggested that a competent engineering staff have charge of all the works of the canal. With such changes, together with a feasible increase in the capacity of the canal, its locks and lifts, so as to accommodate barges of 1,000 tons cargo, the canal rate, according to the committee, could be reduced to ⅔ of a mill per ton-mile, thus securing it against all railroad competition.

The report also compares the advantages of a ship canal for seagoing vessels and a barge canal with reshipment at the seaport. The conclusion is in favor of the barge canal. While the former is a most attractive project, there are enormous difficulties in the construction of such a waterway, and the cost is almost prohibitive. Again, the character of the navigation on the sea, the canal and the lakes varies, and it is a question whether one vessel can economically be adapted to such varying conditions. The answer is in the negative. The cost of the ocean steamer is about $71 per net ton of carrying capacity; the lake steamer $36 per ton, while construction of equal capacity for canal traffic can be had for $7.31 per net ton. To use the higher priced vessel for the lower priced service would cost more than breaking bulk at each end of the canal. The conclusion of the report is in favor of an improved canal.

DENIS T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

Book Reviews.

VIA CRUCIS. A Romance of the Second Crusade. By *Francis Marion Crawford*. 12mo., pp. 396. Illustrated by Louis Loeb. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Mr. Crawford's story was announced a year before it came from the press, at the time when his "Roma Immortalis" had sprung into popular favor. It was expected to be a companion piece for the latter work, because the first announcement was vague. The reading public knew only that Mr. Crawford would write about one of the Crusades as he had written about Rome. With that unreasonable way of reasoning peculiar to the public it jumped to the conclusion that the newer work would be on the same lines as the older one. When it appeared it was seen to be altogether different. The book on Rome is made up of studies from its chronicles, historical and descriptive; the work on the Crusade is a historical romance. It deals with the second attempt to recover Palestine from the Musseulmans which was made by Louis VII. of France and Conrad III. of Germany between 1145 and 1150. This expedition was due to the zeal and energy of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who figures in the story.

The hero is Gilbert Warde, a young Englishman of Norman ancestry, who after being robbed of his rightful inheritance and title through the treachery of his own mother, leaves England and attaches himself to the court of France and to the French army during the Crusade. In the meantime Gilbert's mother had become the wife of the slayer of her husband, whose lover she had been before, and Gilbert is in love with the daughter of his stepfather. This would have been complication enough, but the author really devotes little attention to the hero and heroine and their relations to each, but goes out of his way to bring Queen Eleanor, the wife of Louis VII., to the front. Throughout the story Gilbert is tempted and crossed by the Queen and her unholy love for him. We are told not once or twice only, but many times that she is the most beautiful woman in the world, but unfaithful to her husband. Her wickedness is constantly thrust forward until it becomes very annoying. It might have been passed with a single sentence. We think that Mr. Crawford has marred his story by dwelling on the picture of a queen who is unfaithful, and who despises her husband because he is a pious man, and who speaks of him contemptuously as a monk and not a king. There is no necessary connection between this unsavory chapter in history and a story of the Crusades.

It is to be regretted more because the story is in every other way so good. Mr. Crawford is in love with the subject, had evidently prepared very carefully for the work, and he brings to bear on it all that skill of the novelist which has distinguished him on so many other occasions. His descriptions of characters, scenes and incidents are all glowing with life and carry the reader away to distant times and lands in the most charming manner. While reading them we really seem to be part of the expedition. We see the gay banners, the bright uniforms and the flashing arms; we hear the blare of trumpets, the beat of horses and the shout of failure or triumph. We are about to place the book in the hands of our young men and maidens, when across its beautiful pages walks again and again the unfaithful Queen with a history that is not suited to the light.

The theme punishes Mr. Crawford for touching it so often. Towards the close of the story, when he wishes to tell us that she really left her lawful husband and married Henry Plantagenet, afterwards King Henry II. of England, he places in the mouth of Count Raymond, the Queen's uncle, whom she had consulted in regard to her divorce, these words: "The King, he said, was surely Eleanor's cousin and within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, so that the marriage was null and void, and the Pope would be obliged against his will to adhere to the rule of the Church and pronounce it so. They were cousins in the seventh degree, he said, because the King was descended from Eleanor's great-great-great-great-grandfather, . . . and the seventh degree of consanguinity was still prohibited, and no dispensation had been given, or asked for."

As a divorce was afterwards granted, and both parties married again, the reader will probably conclude that Count Raymond was right, and that the Church approved of the whole transaction. Such was not the case, and this divorce has become such a *cause celèbre* that we think it advisable to furnish our readers with a concise statement of its merits. This can best be done in the words of Hefele, who treats the matter with his usual precision and accuracy in the fifth volume of his "Councils," page 530, second edition:

"Soon after the death of Suger, on the Tuesday before the Pascha Floridum (Palm Sunday) of the year 1152, a Synod at Beaugenci separated King Louis VII. from his consort Eleanora. We have seen above how scandalously she had misbehaved at Antioch during the second crusade. She is even reported to have carried on an amour there with a Turk. She maintained that the extreme continence of her husband gave her a right to compensation elsewhere; for, as she was wont to say, 'she had not married a king, but a monk.' Pope Eugene III. had indeed made an effort to reconcile the royal couple at Tivoli, upon their return from Palestine. He had forbidden them, in the severest terms, ever again to bring forward the plea of consanguinity as an impediment to the validity of their marriage; he had confirmed their union anew, and had inhibited their proposed divorce, upon any pretext whatsoever, under penalty of excommunication. All the more surprising, therefore, is the dissolution of this marriage pronounced by the Synod, in presence of the four Archbishops of Rouen, Rheims, Sens and Bordeaux, as well as of many other French prelates, precisely on the ground of consanguinity, sworn to by numerous witnesses. As soon as her marriage was declared invalid Eleanora espoused the young Prince Henry Plantagenet, later King Henry II. of England."

The incident is "pregnant with instruction." First, the Catholic Church, so far from sanctioning the divorce, had forbidden it, through her supreme authority, in the sternest and most uncompromising manner. As well might we make the Church responsible for the action of Cranmer and the other English prelates in the case of Henry VIII. Secondly, it emphasizes the immortal truth that only a Pope can curb the passions of princes, and that most wisely, at a later date, did the Roman Pontiffs reserve to their own tribunals the matrimonial complications of monarchs. Thirdly, it brands anew with the stigma of sycophancy the miscalled "Gallican liberties."

If we inquire wherefore the Popes did not proceed to extreme measures against the refractory pair and their abettors, there is a twofold explanation. First of all, since neither party to the divorce appealed to the Holy See, the matter did not come before the Papal Court officially. In the second place, the intrigues of Arnold of Brescia and the despotism of Barbarossa kept the Pontiffs fully employed, without permitting them to go out of their way to court further embarrassments. That they had not lost sight of the iniquitous proceedings at Beaugenci, they proved to demonstration when, in the next generation, Philip of France and John of England presumed to imitate the conduct of their respective parents.

WAS SAVONAROLA REALLY EXCOMMUNICATED? An Inquiry by *Rev. J. L. O'Neil, O. P.* Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

The title chosen for his book does not clearly state the nature of the question which Father O'Neil undertakes to answer. There is no doubt about the *reality* of the censure issued by Pope Alexander

VI. against the Florentine friar; it is, in fact, given *in extenso* by our author on page 77. It was duly and solemnly published; was known throughout Christendom; was submitted to for a time by Savonarola until he mustered up courage to defy it. Father O'Neil's contention is that the said excommunication was *invalid*, and that consequently the friar was justified in contemning it. In his endeavor to establish these theses the author displays much erudition and casuistic skill; nevertheless, we fail to see that he has accomplished much in the way of vindicating his hero from the grave charge of disobedience to the Holy See. We are far from believing that he intends to hold up Savonarola as a safe model for men and women who have bound themselves by vows of religion. What would become of monastic discipline, if the commands of superiors, and especially of the Vicar of Christ, were subjected to all these refinings and hair-splittings?

The chivalrous attempt of the author to save the honor of Alexander VI. in the affair of Savonarola is a serious detriment to his argument. Certainly no such attempt was made by the friar when he at length overcame his scruples and launched out on the desperate course which brought him to the scaffold. The true explanation of his defiant conduct is, that, as time went on, he persuaded himself more and more that Alexander, having obtained the tiara by simony, was not a legitimate Pope. In this opinion (whether true or false we need not now determine) he did not by any means stand alone. Three years before eighteen Cardinals, with Rovere and Sforza at their head, had demanded the deposition of Alexander at the hands of the French King. This threat of deposition was so often repeated by all those who sought to intimidate the Pontiff that it became a serious menace to the unity and tranquillity of the Church. Alexander was marvelously indifferent to public opinion and showed little resentment when personally reviled. But when the friar presumed to write letters to the powers of Europe demanding a new Pope, and claiming to act by divine authority, the limit of endurance was certainly passed. It was the following letter that sealed the death warrant of Savonarola. We quote from Villari, vol. ii., p. 292:

"The moment of vengeance has arrived; the Lord commands me to reveal new secrets, and make manifest to the world the peril by which the bark of St. Peter is threatened, owing to your[1] long neglect. . . . Wherefore, the Lord is greatly angered, and hath long left the Church without a shepherd. . . . Now, I hereby testify, *in verbo Domini*, that this Alexander is no Pope. Nor can he be held as one; inasmuch as, leaving aside the mortal sin of simony, by which he hath purchased the Papal Chair, and daily selleth the benefices of the Church to the highest bidder, and likewise putting aside his other manifest vices, I declare that he is no Christian, and believes in no God," and so forth.

---

[1] He is addressing the sovereigns of France, Spain, England, Germany and Hungary.

In whatever light we choose to regard the writer of this bold challenge, we cannot deny that, from the standpoint of the assailed Pope, he was an audacious rebel, whose annihilation was of supreme importance.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION. Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the Period Preceding the Rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet, D. D., O. S. B.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A new publication by the learned Benedictine who has already enriched our literature with such standard works as "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer," and the "Old English Bible," is truly an event deserving to be chronicled throughout the entire English-speaking world. We lost no time, therefore, in purchasing a copy of his latest book, notwithstanding the almost prohibitory price of two dollars and eighty cents, at which it is offered by the Putnams to the American public. We deeply regret that these exorbitant figures will greatly restrict the sale of a book which ought to be found in every home and library.

Some years ago, when reviewing a volume of Janssen's History, we expressed the wish that some learned Englishman would do for England that which the German historian had so successfully accomplished for the Fatherland; that is, to delve among the mountain of historical documents, either recently brought to light or previously left neglected, in order to be able to give a true and unvarnished statement of the religious condition of the country at the outbreak of the Protestant Revolution. This is precisely what Father Gasquet has set about to do, with a diligence not unworthy of Janssen, and without burdening his pages with that apparatus of erudition and minuteness of detail which repels the ordinary reader of the German author. Taking up in separate chapters the various legends which form the mass of Protestant tradition regarding the religion of their Catholic forefathers, he proves by contemporary evidence that they are baseless and valueless. He first nails the lie that the attitude of English churchmen on the eve of the great religious changes was "one of uncompromising hostility to learning and letters;" whereas, "the chief ecclesiastics of the day, Wolsey, Warham, Fisher, Tunstall, Langton, Stokesley, Fox, Selling, Grocyn, Whitford, Linacre, Colet, Pace, William Latimer and Thomas Lupset, to name only the most distinguished, were not only ardent humanists, but thorough and practical churchmen" (p. 36). In the three succeeding chapters he discusses the attitude of the laity of England towards the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, towards the Holy See and towards their clergy; and he proves beyond the possibility of a doubt that, until the unfortunate question of divorce came to disturb the nation, the English laity were loyal and attached to their ecclesiastical superiors.

In this connection we may say that we have an intense dislike of the phrase "ecclesiastical system," which the author seems to have borrowed from Bishop Creighton, and uses occasionally as synonymous with the Catholic principles of faith and government. It smacks of the haphazardness and instability of Anglicanism, and is quite intelligible on the page of the Bishop of London. All the same, it grates on the Catholic ear; and we remember that the objectionable word "system," when employed in the *Acta* of a certain Council, was ordered to be corrected by the Holy See.

In his sixth chapter the author gives what we must designate as a roseate and optimistic account of that literary mountebank of Reformation period, Erasmus of Rotterdam. That Erasmus was not a Lutheran, Father Gasquet most superabundantly proves. But we were unaware that any one believes he was. The proper place of this wretched egotist is in the third Canto of Dante's "Inferno" among that worthless crew,

> A Dio spiacenti ed a' nemici sui.

Instead of wasting fifty-three valuable pages on him, it would have been better "to look and pass him by."

In chapter vii. it is demonstrated that Protestantism was not native to English soil, but was imported from Germany. The common impression that Lollardry survived to be merged into Lutheranism is shown to be utterly false; for the last relics of Wycliffism had long perished. The progress of modern error, it is proved, was slow and tardy. After an interesting chapter on "The Printed English Bible," the author refutes the oft-repeated calumny that the pre-Reformation clergy in England had neglected the duty of instructing the people in Christian doctrine and had left them in complete ignorance. After reading the provisions made for the careful instruction of the people, we are filled with amazement at the unnatural brutality of those Protestant writers and declaimers who for generations have gloried in the alleged degradation of their forefathers. What a powerful bond of union is the Catholic faith! Even those of us who drank in a hatred of English tyranny together with our mothers' milk, are nevertheless infinitely nearer in sympathy to the English of Catholic days than their own apostate children.

After two more chapters, in which the author describes the benign provisions made for the support of religion and charity, he ends with an interesting account of the popular devotion to pilgrimage and relics.

We have simply said enough to whet the appetite of our readers for this very important contribution to our English Catholic literature; for which we return sincerest thanks to the learned and diligent author.

LEAVES FROM ST. AUGUSTINE. By *Mary H. Allies.* Edited by T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. Second edition revised and corrected. 12mo, pp. 483. London: Washburne & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This book is a companion volume to "Leaves from St. John Chrysostom," by the same author. They both belong to the same family as the Characteristics of Manning, Wiseman and Newman. Indeed, the latter title seems to express more clearly the character of the book. This is indicated by a passage in the preface of the present volume, which says that the author wishes her readers to be able "to form some notion of the personal character, the doctrine, the faith, the hope, the charity of the man who ranks among the Fathers of the Church as St. Paul among the Apostles."

The work of compiling this volume was very great. The Edinburgh edition of St. Augustine's works consists of fifteen octavo volumes. The Oxford translation is even larger, but both together do not contain all that has been preserved. If the author had used these editions she would have lightened her labors a great deal; but she does not even refer to them. The work is entirely her own: choice of passages and translation.

She divides the book into four parts, headed respectively, "Personal and Philosophical," "Doctrine in Daily Life," "The Kingdom of Our Lord on Earth" and "Eternity." It will be seen at a glance that under these divisions a summary may be made of the great Doctor's writings. It was a great task, but it has been successfully done. Such books are very valuable. Bad books are generally short and attractive. It is so easy to deny facts in history, or to distort them. One word or a sentence is enough to throw doubt on some doctrine, whereas full treatises or whole volumes may be required to correct these errors. Thousands may learn the false lesson for the one who has time to learn the true. Comparatively few persons have the time and ability to read the works of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, or of their followers and pupils, like Wiseman and Newman and Manning. But in books like the one before us the task is made easy and pleasant. Only those who have used such books know how well they answer the needs of the ordinary student. It is best always to go to the original—the fountain head—but for the great majority that cannot do so, books like this one are very valuable and very useful.

BILDER AUS DER GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN KUNST UND LITURGIE IN ITALIEN. *Von Stephan Beissel, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.50.

This book may be called a series of illustrated lectures on the relation of ancient Christian art in Italy to the divine worship. It is addressed more especially to priests and ecclesiastical students, although the educated laity may also derive great profit from the perusal of it. It is not a history of art for its own sake, but has the practical purpose of giving the reader a better understanding of the liturgy and ceremonies of Holy Church. It would be difficult to crowd so much valuable information into the compass of 328 pages as this veteran teacher has accomplished. The 200 illustrations which accompany the text make what might otherwise be of interest only to antiquarians pleasant and easy reading to any one who takes up the book. It will be of especial interest and instruction to those who contemplate a visit to Italy. We congratulate the firm of Herder upon the typographical excellence of the volume, and look forward eagerly to the companion volume on mediæval art which is promised by the author.

SOUVENIR OF LORETTO CENTENARY, 1799–1899. October 10, 1899. 8vo, pp. 405. Copiously illustrated. Cresson, Pa.: Swope Brothers, printers.

"This work is simply what its title indicates—a souvenir of the centenary of this parish, the oldest in Western Pennsylvania. It makes no pretence to originality, but is merely a compilation of papers, facts, names and dates, which show forth the progress made during the century just closed, and furnish valuable and interesting data for the future historian of the Church in this diocese."

In these modest words the rector of St. Michael's Church, Loretto, Pa., presents his valuable historical work to the public. The opening words of his preface, which we have quoted and which are apologetic in form, might be used boastfully. No stronger recommendation could be given to any book of history than to say that it is a true compilation of papers, facts, names and dates. It is desirable that these shall be linked together and set forth in such attractive form as to charm while instructing; but as history is very often distorted and made useless or harmful in order to make it charming, it is far better to limit it to the bare statement of facts.

Father Kittell brings to his work all the requirements for success. He is learned; he is a student of history; he has a rich field in Loretto, and he loves the work. The result is a very valuable contribution to the history of the Church in Pennsylvania. It will be best appreciated in the future, when a fuller history shall be written and the opportunity to gather facts here brought together shall have passed. Students of history would do well to secure copies of this work at once.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCES, 1897-1899. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 413. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"On the 2d of April, 1895, the Holy See decided to tolerate the residence of Catholic laymen at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. A condition was appended that there should be established for their benefit regular courses of lectures or conferences by Catholic professors, in which philosophy, history and religion were to be treated with amplitude and solidity. An instruction, embodying this decision, was sent out by the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, August, 1896. All that has been found practicable hitherto has been to assemble the Catholic undergraduates on Sunday mornings by themselves in an oratory, where Mass is said and half an hour's conference addressed to them. These conferences (in the book before us) represent the author's share in the work. They are republished with some slight revision."

These conferences have been published before in separate form, but they are now brought together for the first time. They form a very useful collection for all persons, but especially for young men who are coming in daily contact with the world and its false maxims. They are an excellent antidote for the sneers and misrepresentations that do so much harm to religion and its true representative, the Roman Catholic Church. They should be read by our young men who are students of non-sectarian schools and universities, so-called, for there are no such institutions in fact. The very same dangers that confront Catholic students at Oxford and Cambridge exist in our secular schools, but in an exaggerated form. The prudence which moved the Holy Father to require the safeguards of these conferences for the more ancient institutions would advise them also for the more modern, if it were possible to introduce them. We hope, at least, that the publishers and agents of this and similar volumes will use every means in their power to bring them to the attention of Catholic students.

The present volume contains twenty-two conferences held at Oxford and twenty-three held at Cambridge. The subjects embrace philosophy, theology, history and liturgy. In them the learned author defends truth and combats error in that clear, straightforward style that is characteristic of him and that is irresistible.

NEW FOOTSTEPS IN WELL-TRODDEN WAYS. By *Katherine E. Conway.* Boston: The Pilot Publishing Company.

The "pledge" which Miss Conway took "not to write a new book" on her recent trip to Europe, was one of those rash resolutions which one "sins in making, and would sin more grievously in keeping." We are pleased, therefore, that she good-naturedly "yielded to the solicitation of circumstance." Her notes of travel are just such as we might have expected from a pious Catholic lady of her culture, independence of thought, American wide-awakedness and journalistic experience. Her previous reading had well equipped her for a profitable trip to the European capitals. She knew with precision what she wished to see, and saw more in a few months than an ordinary tourist would have seen in years.

MY NEW CURATE. A Story Gathered from the Stray Leaves of an Old Diary. By the *Rev. P. A. Sheehan*, P. P. Doneraile (Diocese of Cloyne). 12mo., pp. 480. Illustrated. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

Most of our readers are, probably, familiar with this story in its serial form in the *American Ecclesiastical Review.* It was begun in that magazine very quietly, without any previous announcement or promise of its merits, and without the author's name. From the first it was seen to be the work of a master hand. The characters were true to nature; they were introduced naturally and developed gradually in the midst of the proper surroundings and as occasion demanded their presence. The scenes of action were so clearly described as to produce that atmospheric effect which artists try so hard to get without success. Each character taught a lesson, without at all giving offense or lessening the interest of the story, although novelists generally hold that this cannot be done. Altogether the story in the *Ecclesiastical Review* sprang into instant favor and attracted widespread attention. There was a general demand for it in book form, and it was sold as fast as it came from the press. Already the fifth edition is on the market.

It is very attractive in its new dress. It is excellently printed on good paper. The illustrations are generally disappointing. Not in workmanship, but in conception. This is particularly true of those which picture the parish priest and the curate. They are not the Daddy Dan and the Father Letheby whose acquaintance we made in the pages of the *Ecclesiastical.* The artist has surely failed to see through the eyes of the author. This may not strike the new reader so strongly as it does the old one, because the former has the assistance of the artist in forming his conceptions, but very rarely, indeed, does a portrait satisfy one who has seen the original or formed a mind picture of him from a good description.

"My New Curate" will last. It is a distinctive work without a rival. It is so well done that later comers of the same kind, and very likely they will appear, cannot displace it.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610–1791. Vol. LX. Lower Canada, Illinois, Iroquois, Ottawas: 1675–1677. 8vo, pp. 323. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers.

This great work is progressing steadily and rapidly. It was a big undertaking, and many had doubts about its completion; but the steady progress made up to the present time is a guarantee of ultimate success. The work is intensely interesting and immensely valuable. It was never published before in the originals with translations, and very likely it will never be published again. When we consider that the seven hundred and fifty copies which make up the whole edition will be scattered over the world, and allow for loss by accident and natural decay, we can easily understand the enormously increased value of the work in future years.

The same standard of excellence is followed in this volume that was followed in preceding volumes. We have the same simple, straightforward, truthful narration of facts with every detail, that is more interesting than fiction and more valuable than imagination. Each new volume is a new story, or series of stories, which have never been equaled, and the happy possessors of the work await each addition to it with great interest while they hope for its completion.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S MIDDLE LIFE. From 1845 to 1855. By *Henry L. Brownson.* 8vo, pp. 646. Detroit: H. L. Brownson.

This is the second volume of the "Life of Dr. Brownson." The first was called "Brownson's Early Life." The present volume begins with his entrance into the Catholic Church, as in the previous book the reader was brought down to that period. Every part of Dr. Brownson's life is interesting, but probably the period embraced in this volume is the most interesting of all. It shows the active mind, strong intellect and indomitable will at work for the first time without doubt or hesitation in the true Church of Christ. The time was most propitious. It was at a period when such a champion was needed to combat the senseless ravings of Know-Nothingism. Brownson was the man for the occasion, and right valiantly he gave battle.

The book is a valuable contribution to history, and when the succeeding volume has appeared, the work will be a necessity for all who would understand rightly the events of the years during which Brownson labored for the true and the good.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

DIE HEILIGEN SACRAMENTE DER KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHE. Fuer die Seelsorger dogmatisch dargestellt von *Dr. Nikolaus Gihr*. Second volume treats of Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony. Freiburg and St. Louis : Herder. Price, $2.35 net.

VESPERS AND COMPLINE. A Soggarth's Sacred Verses. By *Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J.*, author of "Idyls of Killowen," etc. 12mo., pp. 155. Price, $1.00. London : Burns & Oates. New York : Benziger Brothers.

MEDITATIONS FOR RETREAT. Taken from the Writings of St. Francis de Sales. Arranged by St. Jane Frances Frémiot de Chantal. 16mo., pp. 202. Price, 75 cents. New York : Benziger Brothers.

DES APOSTELS PAULUS BRIEF AN DIE PHILIPPER. Ueberstetzt und erklaert von *Dr. theol. Karl Joseph Mueller*, Professor, Geistl. Rath in Breslau. Freiburg and St. Louis : Herder. Price, $2.50 net.

DIE GENESIS nach dem Literalsinn erklaert. Von *Gottfried Hoberg*, Doctor der Philosophie und der Theologie. Freiburg and St. Louis : Herder. Price, $3.10 net.

THE STORY OF THE DIVINE CHILD. Told for Children in Pictures and in Words. By *Very Rev. Dean A. A. Lings*. 16mo., pp. 256. New York : Benziger Brothers.

THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB. By *Kenelm Digby Best*, of the Oratory. 12mo.. pp. 180. Price, $1.00. London : Burns & Oates. New York : Benziger Brothers.

THE MORROW OF LIFE. Translated from the French of the Abbé Henry Bolo. 12mo., pp. 253. New York : Benziger Brothers.

ST. ANTHONY OF PADUA AND THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. By *Rev. Francis Dent*. 12mo., pp. 253. New York : P. J. Kennedy.

THE ROOM OF THE ROSE, and Other Stories. By *Sara Trainer Smith*. 12mo., pp. 266. Philadelphia : John Joseph McVey.

CHRONICLES OF "THE LITTLE SISTERS." By *Mary E. Mannix*. 12mo., pp. 378. Notre Dame, Ind.: *The Ave Maria*.

OVER THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS TO ALASKA. By *Charles Warren Stoddard*. 12mo., pp. 168. St. Louis : B. Herder.

70757

PERIODICAL

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE